

Boyle, Orville T., Jr.
Brown, John B.
Bryant, Robert E.
Carlson, Harry W., Jr.
Clary, Irl C.
Fischbach, Reynolds J., II
Greenlee, William H.
Hickman, Warren J.
McKay, James R.
Meyer, Gene P.
Molle, William H.

O'Connell, Christopher J., Jr.
O'Shea, Edward J., Jr.
Porter, William J.
Reynolds, John A. S.
Stewart, Billy A.
Stucker, William E.
Tanner, Thomas P.
Thomas, Robert J.
VanZandt, William R.
Wallace, Donald C.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Pred, Gordon D.

NURSE CORPS

Anderson, Kathryn I.
Best, Mildred E.
Brice, Karolla
Crouch, Madge L.
Dunne, Ellen T.

Foltz, Frances C.
Grushinski, Jeanne E.
Hall, May B.
Santeiu, Betty M.

The following named Naval Reserve officers for temporary promotion to the grade of commander in the staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefore as provided by law:

MEDICAL CORPS

Alvarez, Reinaldo G.
Ammons, John C., Jr.
Armstrong, James R.
Bass, George L., Jr.
Borgman, Theodore J. Jr.
Boring, James H.
Browning, Robert W.
Cavenar, Jesse O., Jr.
Chapman, James H.
Chun, Clyde W.
Cobb, James R.
Creson, Daniel L.
Dinan, John T., Jr.
Earnest, David L., III
Edwards, John P.
Fontanelli, Enio
Frery, Lynn R.
Gleason, Terrence H.
Greer, Mack V.
Grimes, Cecil D., Jr.
Grimes, James A.
Hamilton, William R.
Hinz, William M.
Jackson, William B.
Jones, Wendell E.
Jordan, Robert E.
Kelly, Thaddeus E.
Kerstein, Morris D.

Knowles, Robert C.
Knudson, Robert D.
Leverett, Cary L.
Love, James T., Jr.
Lutz, Robert D.
Mable, James E., Jr.
Marlowe, Frank I.
Miner, James M.
Moore, Laurie W.
Oliver, Richard T.
O'Malley, Edward P.
O'Neill, Edward J.
Parisi, Frank
Rabcevic, Anatole
Rankin, Robert A. M.
Reeves, Charles S.
Renfro, Carl E.
Robinson, Gary L.
Rosene, Philip G.
Ryter, Stephen R.
Scaring, William A.
Sutton, Phon D., Jr.
Uznanski, Kenneth M.
VonDoepp, Christian E.
Walker, Robert D., III
Wellish, Carl S.
Zel, Gerald
Zelko, James J.

SUPPLY CORPS

Allan, Ronald C.
Arensmeyer, Haldor J.
Bender, John H.
Boye, Robert C.
Brustares, James S.
Connell, James J.
Daquin, Frank J., Jr.
Deckert, Warren P.
Denney, Jay R.
Eickhoff, Roger C.
Fischetti, John A.
Garbarini, Anthony P., Jr.
Hammerstrom, Erland D.
Jackson, Robert M.
Krupinski, Stephen R., Jr.
Lamphear, Steven C.
Lieblein, Robert V.
McCann, Charles J., Jr.

McCarty, Richard L.
McCay, Wilton T., Jr.
Moore, Robin H. S.
Moss, Thomas A.
Norby, Karl G.
O'Brien, Joseph E., Jr.
Pagel, Barton L.
Peck, Leo J.
Pinsker, Clive D.
Pizzano, William C.
Price, Jacob M.
Reuscher, Edward J.
Rice, Robert C., Jr.
Russell, Scott C.
Shaw, Robert R.
Sheill, Gordon W.
Stevens, Louis A.
Vilella, Conrad L.
Walrod, Donald
Wanko, John
Wilmoth, James P., III

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Canniff, James B.
Hansen, Roger K.
Hunt, John R.
Loesch, Nathan O.
Longnecker, Nelson C.
McConnell, William J.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Belson, Harold B.
Block, Neil
Bogan, William F.
Collins, Robert W.
Daniels, Joe D.
Davis, John M.
Doctor, Richard P.
Doughty, Edward E.
Gaul, William M.
Gray, Robert W., Jr.
Gutierrez, Rosendo, Jr.
Haley, Charles E.
Helton, Ronald L.
Holm, William D.
Hoskins, Walter S.
Karpis, John
Knox, Kenneth B.

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS

Abel, Robert M.
Adams, Jared H.
Adams, Joseph A., Jr.
Allen, John F., III
Belser, Townsend M., Jr.
Birkmeyer, Roy J.
Brant, Kirby E.
Frank, "M" Allan

Rieder, Richard E.
Spaeth, Karl H.

DENTAL CORPS

Adams, James T.
Anderson, Stanley N., Jr.
Balmforth, John B.
Bjorn Dahl, Robert W.
Bogert, John A.
Brown, Allen K.
Bush, Richard D.
Dittmer, John C.
Elschen, James J.
Emery, Lee E., Sr.
Ferry, Edward T.
Finagin, William B.
Grage, Walter A.

Graupner, John G.
Harrison, William S.
Herman, Harry A., Jr.
Hill, David H.
Hoover, William G.
Joy, Edwin D., Jr.
Levine, Lowell J.
Martin, Donald W.
Menke, Henry J.
Mitchem, John C.
Sherard, Harold T.
Simpson, Oscar V., Jr.
Sweeney, James M.
Szakaly, John S.

MEDICAL SERVICE CENTER

Brown, Burdeen F.
Carrera, Richard N.
Emerson, George S. G.

Holland, Francis J.
Lindberg, David S.

NURSE CORPS

Bauer, Catherine M.
Buttner, Virginia H.
Hart, Sarah E.

Murphy, Anna T.
Purdy, Claire H.
Quinn, Frances M.

The following named women Naval Reserve officers for permanent promotion to the grade of captain in the Supply Corps, subject to qualification therefore as provided by law:

Mariam, Ethel
Wirtschatter, Irene N.

Comdr. Neal F. Current, Civil Engineer Corps, U.S. Naval Reserve, for transfer to and appointment in the line of the Naval Reserve in the permanent grade of commander, subject to qualification therefore as provided by law.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 14, 1975:

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

John F. Lehman, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

(The above nomination was approved subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

U.S. COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

Albert B. Fletcher, Jr., of Kansas, to be a judge of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals for the remainder of the term expiring May 1, 1986.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IT IS FINISHED

HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 10, 1975

Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, for weeks now we have witnessed the rapid deterioration of the political situation for the governments in South Vietnam and Cambodia. Simultaneously, we see an analogous development here at home: The President and his spokesmen hasten the deterioration of cooperation between the executive and legislative branches, as the administration's foreign policy drifts dangerously apart from American public opinion.

Lately President Ford has been telling the American people and the Congress that he is "drawing the line" against

additional wasteful Federal spending. Yet simultaneously, he asks us to provide more assistance to a military aid program that has resulted in about a billion dollars in military equipment paid for by American taxpayers—left in the Vietnamese dust. The Khmer Rouge in Cambodia too have gained strength as they secure abandoned American guns and military hardware.

The President's credibility on the issue of wasteful Federal spending has worn thin indeed when he proposes such ridiculous and wasteful expenditures.

The administration's insistence on following an obviously disastrous course is based largely on the stubbornness of policymakers such as Secretary of State Kissinger, an architect of increased American involvement in Cambodia in 1970.

What we see today is the culmination of years of misguided and unrealistic

policies and strategies. An April 3 column by Anthony Lewis in the New York Times provides a vivid description of the roots of our involvement in Cambodia and the results, in terms of human suffering and misery, of the incalcitrance of recent U.S. foreign policymakers. For those of us who have protested against this war and who now vote against any further arms to fuel it, Mr. Lewis' writings have been a great inspiration:

IT IS FINISHED

(By Anthony Lewis)

"I can only tell you my emotional reaction, getting into that country. If I could have found the military or State Department leader who has been the architect of this policy, my instinct would be to strangle him up. . . . What they have done to the country is greater evil than we have done to any country in the world"—Representative PAUL McCLOSKEY, testifying after his recent visit to Cambodia.

Boston, April 2.—The images from Indo-

china assall us with their misery and horror. The ones from Phnom Penh are in a way the hardest to bear: Those children are starving because of an American blunder—recent, utterly avoidable and prolonged in the teeth of reason.

The American intervention in Vietnam may be explained in terms of the assumptions of another era. For Cambodia there is no excuse. It was wanton cruelty, reckless and useless.

Unlike Vietnam, it is relatively easy to trace the American involvement in Cambodia. The crucial decisions were made in 1970 by Richard Nixon, with the advice and support of Henry Kissinger. They led inexorably, predictably, to tragedy—death and destruction for Cambodia, moral and political disaster for the United States.

Until 1970 Prince Sihanouk had kept Cambodia relatively peaceful by an intricate neutralist game. He turned a blind eye to Vietnamese Communist use of his eastern provinces, then to American bombing of those areas. His policy was untidy, but it worked.

The idea of invading Cambodia had occasionally come up in the Pentagon, but it was never taken seriously. At one meeting in the 1960's the chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Gen. Earle Wheeler, said: "Why the hell does Westy [Gen. William Westmoreland, U.S. Commander in Vietnam] need more battlefields to fight on?"

Then, in March 1970, Lon Nol took over in a coup. He abandoned neutralism, announcing that he would attack the Vietnamese Communist forces, and there was a slaughter of Vietnamese civilian residents around Phnom Penh. Not surprisingly, the North Vietnamese began moving on Lon Nol's weak army.

In this situation Mr. Nixon and Mr. Kissinger revived the old idea of an American invasion. They overrode doubts within the Administration, from, among others, Secretary of Defense Laird and Secretary of State Rogers. Mr. Kissinger accused one doubter of showing the cowardice of the Eastern Establishment."

Five members of Mr. Kissinger's own staff warned that a Cambodian operation would enlarge the war without benefit to the U.S. Three resigned: Anthony Lake, Roger Morris, William Watts. They went quietly because, as Mr. Lake explained recently, "We were very concerned about damaging Kissinger. Then they put a tap on my telephone, which shows how much they were impressed by our scruples."

Mr. Nixon told the world it would be only a brief and limited "incursion," to clean out the Communist areas. Mr. Kissinger said the same thing to the White House staff. William Safire's book, "Before the Fall," describes a meeting at which the staff was given a National Security paper saying, "This is not a long-term 'quicksand' operation that would lead to a new 'Vietnam situation' in Cambodia."

But it did. Mr. Nixon and Mr. Kissinger, having said they would not intervene on Lon Nol's behalf in the Cambodian dispute, soon did just that. Before long B-52's were bombing all of Cambodia. In five years, the United States sent \$2 billion in aid to Lon Nol.

The results were exactly as the dissenters on the Kissinger staff had predicted: a wider war, increasing Cambodian opposition to Lon Nol, destruction of the countryside, finally a Communist instead of a neutralist Cambodia.

The end has been inevitable for a long time, but the Administration preferred to have the Cambodians go on starving and dying rather than admit the bankruptcy of its policy. It kept the war going with the tattered argument that more military aid would somehow lead to peace.

Now that Lon Nol has left, the United States could still help toward a humane transition. Most important, we should offer to continue our flights of food and medicine whoever rules in Phnom Penh, and ask Sihanouk's cooperation. We should do that for our sake as well as the desperate Cambodians. But there can be no easy expiation for one of the most terrible episodes in the history of American foreign policy.

What Richard Nixon and Henry Kissinger did cannot be undone or forgotten. All we can do is try to make certain that American leaders are never again able to make such decisions on their own, in secret, against advice—and then persist for years in a futile and destructive policy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to remind my colleagues that this month marks the 60th anniversary of the height of the genocide against the Armenian people. In 1915, as a "final solution" to the "Armenian problem," the Ottoman Empire uprooted and then exterminated millions of Armenians. This precedent was used by Adolph Hitler to justify his own extermination programs.

I believe all Americans should take note of and remember these tragic events. I sincerely hope that the memory of this terrible genocide will serve to prevent the reoccurrence of other future brutalities.

IRS GUIDELINES ON NEW TAX CREDIT FOR HOME PURCHASE

HON. DAVID W. EVANS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 10, 1975

Mr. EVANS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, in the last week, my office has been deluged with telephone calls and letters from constituents who are interested in that portion of the Tax Reduction Act of 1975 dealing with the tax credit for the purchase of a new home.

I am inserting below for the information of my constituents and colleagues the guidelines which were released today by the Internal Revenue Service on the tax credit provisions of the new law:

IRS GUIDELINES ON NEW TAX CREDIT FOR HOME PURCHASE

Guidelines for claiming the credit for purchase of a new principal residence under the Tax Reduction Act of 1975 were announced today by the Internal Revenue Service. Taxpayers may rely upon the guidelines pending issuance of regulations.

Section 208 of the Act, new Internal Revenue Code section 44, provides a Federal income tax credit of 5 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted basis with respect to a new principal residence purchased or constructed by the taxpayer, if it is constructed, acquired, and occupied within specified periods. The maximum credit is \$2,000 (\$1,000 in the case of a married taxpayer filing a separate return, and the credit may not exceed the amount of the taxpayer's tax liability.

To qualify for the credit the following conditions must be met:

- (1) The residence must be a new principal residence.
- (2) The construction must have begun before March 26, 1975.
- (3) The residence must be acquired and occupied as a principal residence after March 12, 1975 and before January 1, 1977.

(4) Except in the case of self-construction, a binding contract for the purchase of the residence must be entered into before January 1, 1976, and

(5) Except in the case of self-construction, the buyer must attach to his return a certification by the seller that the purchase price is the lowest price at which the residence was ever offered for sale.

The property purchased must be a new principal residence of the taxpayer, the original use of which commences with the taxpayer. The term "principal residence" refers to the place where the taxpayer lives most of the year and has the same meaning as under section 1034 of the Code. The term "residence" includes a single family structure, a residential unit in a condominium or cooperative housing project, the taxpayer's portion of a duplex or a row house, and a mobile home. The residence must be new. A renovated building does not qualify as new for this purpose, regardless of the extent of the renovation. The "original use" of the new principal residence by the taxpayer means that such residence has never been lived in prior to acquisition by the taxpayer. For these purposes, a residence will be treated as never having been lived in prior to acquisition if the first occupancy was by the taxpayer pursuant to a lease arrangement pending settlement under a binding contract to purchase or pursuant to a lease arrangement where a written option to purchase was contained in the original lease agreement.

The credit applies only to a new principal residence the construction of which began before March 26, 1975. For this purpose, construction is considered to commence when actual physical work of a significant amount has occurred at the building site. A significant amount of construction requires more than drilling to determine soil conditions, preparation of an architect's sketches, securing of a building permit, or grading the land. However, digging of the footings, excavation of the building site, or similar work constitute a significant amount of construction.

Construction of a mobile home or a factory-built house is considered to commence when construction of important parts of the mobile home or factory-built house commenced. Construction or assembly of a minor portion of the components of the mobile home or factory-built house does not constitute commencement of construction.

The credit applies only to property acquired and occupied as a principal residence by the taxpayer after March 12, 1975, and before January 1, 1977. However, where the residence is acquired by purchase rather than self-construction, it must also have been acquired by the taxpayer under a binding contract entered into before January 1, 1976. For these purposes, a taxpayer has "acquired" a residence when legal title to it is conveyed to him at settlement, or he has possession of it pursuant to a binding purchase contract under which he makes periodic payments until he becomes entitled under the contract to demand conveyance of title. The credit may not be claimed until both the acquisition and occupancy tests have been satisfied. Thus, where a taxpayer meets the acquisition test set forth above after March 2, 1975, and occupies the property as a new principal residence before January 1, 1976, the credit is allowed on the taxpayer's 1975 tax return. Thus, a taxpayer may be entitled to the credit with respect to a residence where a purchase contract was entered into prior to March 13, 1975, so long as settlement and occupancy occur after March 12, 1975.

Taxpayers claiming the credit should attach new IRS Form 5405 to their tax returns on which the credit is claimed. An announcement will be made when the form is available. Except in the case of self-construction, taxpayers must also attach a cer-

tification by the seller that the purchase price is the lowest price at which the residence was ever offered for sale.

The following form of the certification statement will be accepted:

I certify that the construction of the residence at [specify address] was begun before March 26, 1975, and that this residence has never been offered for sale in a listing, a written private offer, or an offer by means of advertisement at a lower purchase price than [state price], the price at which I sold the residence to [state name, present address, and social security number of purchaser] by contract dated [give date].

[Date, seller's signature and taxpayer identification number.]

An offer to sell is limited to a listing, a written private offer or an offer by means of advertisement to sell a specified residence at a specified purchase price.

In determining whether a residence was sold at the lowest purchase price ever offered, appropriate adjustment shall be made for differences in financing terms and closing costs which increase the sellers actual net proceeds and the purchasers actual cost. Where the sale to the taxpayer includes property which was not the subject of the prior offer or excludes property which was included in the prior offer, the amount of the prior offer shall be adjusted to reflect the fair market value of such property, provided that the taxpayer had the option to require inclusion or exclusion of such property included in the sale. The fair market value of any excluded property is to be determined at the time of the prior offer, while all additions are to be valued at their fair market value on the date of execution of the contract of sale.

The adjusted basis of the new principal residence on which the credit is computed includes all amounts which are attributable to the acquisition or construction of the taxpayer's new principal residence, but only to the extent that such amounts constitute capital expenditures and are not allowable as deductions in computing taxable income. The adjusted basis is reduced by any gain from the sale of an old principal residence, which is not recognized due to the application of section 1033 or section 1034. Thus, if a taxpayer sells an old principal residence for \$30,000 which has an adjusted basis of \$20,000 and reinvests the proceeds by purchasing a new principal residence for \$40,000 (including settlement costs which are capital in nature) and this purchase satisfies the statutory criteria under section 1034 for nonrecognition of gain, then the credit would apply with respect to \$30,000 of the cost of the new principal residence. The credit allowable under this section does not in any way affect the taxpayer's basis in his new principal residence.

The Tax Reduction Act also increased the replacement periods provided in section 1034 from 1 year to 18 months in the case of purchase and from 18 months to 2 years in the case of self-construction. This provision applies to old residences sold or exchanged after December 31, 1974.

Where self-construction of a principal residence was begun before March 13, 1975, only that portion of the basis of the property allocable to construction after March 12, 1975, and before January 1, 1977, shall be taken into consideration in determining the amount of the credit allowable. Thus, if prior to March 13, 1975, a taxpayer who qualifies for the credit has constructed a portion of a residence at a cost of \$10,000 and the total cost of the residence is \$40,000, \$30,000 will be subject to the credit.

Where a new principal residence is purchased by more than one taxpayer other than a husband and wife, the amount of the credit allowed will be allocated among the taxpayers in proportion to their respective ownership interests in such residence, with

the limitation that the sum of the credits allowed to all such taxpayers shall not exceed \$2,000. For this purpose, joint tenants with right of survivorship are treated as equal owners.

The credit is allowed with respect to only one residence of the taxpayer. In addition, the credit is not available for purchases from certain persons related to the taxpayer. Such related persons include the taxpayer's spouse, ancestors and lineal descendants and certain related corporations, partnerships and trusts described in section 267 and 707(b) of the Code.

The Act also provides for recapture in the event of a sale or other disposition of the residence within a 36-month period with exceptions for reinvestment in a new principal residence and for certain involuntary dispositions.

Civil penalties and criminal fines and imprisonment could result from false certification by a seller. If it is found that the price for which the residence was sold is not in fact the lowest price for which the residence was ever offered for sale, then the statute provides that a seller who certified that it was, is liable to the purchaser for damages in an amount equal to three times the excess over the lowest purchase price plus reasonable attorney's fees. No income tax deduction is allowed to the seller for two-thirds of any damages paid or incurred pursuant to a judgment entered against him in a suit brought by a purchaser on this issue. An individual who falsely certifies is liable for criminal penalties such as those under section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code.

In the absence of the taxpayer's participation in, or knowledge of, a false certification by the seller, the credit is not denied to a taxpayer who otherwise qualifies for the credit solely because the seller has falsely certified that the new principal residence was sold at the lowest price at which the residence was ever offered for sale.

THE ELECTRIC SCANDALS OF '75

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 14, 1975

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extension of Remarks an excellent article regarding electric utilities, which appeared in the March 1975 issue of the Progressive. Entitled "The Electric Scandals of '75," it is written by Ed Meyers, staff director of the District of Columbia City Council's Committee on Finance and Revenue, and John Musial, director of special studies at the Wayne State University Center for Energy Studies.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ELECTRIC SCANDALS OF '75

(By Ed Meyers and John Musial)

Americas private electric power companies have long been getting away with some enormously profitable and discriminatory abuses of the average ratepayers. These abuses have escaped public attention because most of the people trust the so-called regulated utilities that supply them with their heat, light, and power, and few understand the economic and technical mazes of the electrical world. Those who do understand usually lack the money or influence needed to put up a good fight.

Since millions of citizens have become accustomed to corruption as part of the American fabric, it is hard to shock anyone with new scandals, but try these:

Scandal One: If you live in a major American city, chances are you either are now, or soon will be, paying close to double what you should be paying for your electric current.

In recent years, particularly since the mid-1960s, electricity rates have been skyrocketing. The end is nowhere in sight, as electric companies across the land have filed requests for even higher rates with the state public utility commissions charged with watching over these firms. Some of the rate applications involve increases of 20 per cent, 30 per cent, or more. As soon as they win approval of these increases, the companies file applications for more.

These increases are triggered, in large measure, by huge increases in the demand for electricity—most of which come from the insatiable suburbs. The heavy suburban demand requires the construction of new generating plants, which are more complex and costly than ever before.

The populations of our big cities have remained stable or have been declining. For example, Cleveland lost 125,000 people in the 1960s, Pittsburgh 84,000, and Detroit 159,000, while their suburbs gained several hundred thousand. Now, the average city resident consumes much less electric power than the average suburban resident; for example, 274 units a month for the average San Francisco customer, compared to 531 for the average customer in the metropolitan Bay Area.

Residents of big cities do not need most of the new generating plants. The existing plants, plus a few minor additions in some cases, would be sufficient to supply electricity to city residents and businesses for decades to come. But city residents are in "service areas" which are drawn by the utilities to include the fast growing suburbs, so that city people and firms must pay for the costs of new plants, which they do not need, through ever larger monthly electric bills.

This is, at least, a billion dollar annual subsidy from city people to those fun-loving suburbanites.

Scandal Two: Have you ever noticed that the new nuclear power plants take much longer to construct and cost much more than anticipated, and that once they are built, they seldom reach their promised level of efficiency? A \$110 million nuclear plant in the Detroit Edison empire was actually abandoned for a while because it could not produce electricity efficiently enough to justify its operating costs. The new nuclear plants have been producing electricity at per-unit costs which are 50 to 100 per cent higher than those of conventional fossil fuel and hydro plants already in operation. Such economic disasters surely must cut into corporate profits. Right?

Wrong. Nuclear plants are the electrical industry's biggest bonanza. Under the industry's cost-plus system, the costs to construct nuclear plants are baked in to the company's "rate base," or the assets of the company upon which a "fair rate-of-return" (usually from 7 to 10 per cent) is computed. The more costly the nuclear plants the industry builds, the greater will be corporate profits, in absolute dollar amounts.

Scandal Three: Most consumers have the impression that they are protected from rate inequities because electric companies must argue their cases, in a quasi-judicial process, before a public utilities commission. The sad fact is that the deck is hopelessly stacked against the ratepaying public. The electric companies pour a quarter-million dollars or more into a rate case, and these expenditures are charged off as legitimate operating expenses. In other words, the ratepayers must pay, in their monthly bills, for the utilities' costs of shoving rate increases down the

ratepayers' throats. Consumers also pay for power company advertising aimed at convincing ratepayers that rate increases are good for them.

So on the one side at the rate hearing is the company, with several hundred pages of testimony, exhibits and computer printouts, along with the best attorneys, rate engineers, and consultants money can buy. On the other side, representing the beleaguered ratepayer is—usually—no one at all.

The lowly ratepayers simply cannot compete in such a situation. Though the ratepayers must pay for the electric company's attorneys and consultants in their monthly electric bills, they must also spend several thousand dollars out of their own pockets to hire an attorney and an expert witness to fight the rate increase. And for every expert witness the consumer can find, the electric company can find a half-dozen \$500-a-day graduates of prestigious universities, who have been qualified and respected rate engineers for decades longer than the consumer's witness. Hence it is no wonder that most rate increase requests go virtually uncontested.

Scandal Four: If you are unfortunate enough to be just a human being, and not a huge manufacturing firm with windows instead of eyes and bricks instead of bones, you must pay the price for your inferior genetics. In 1972, the average price per kilowatt-hour paid by residential customers, nationwide, was 2.42 cents. However, the average price paid by industrial customers was just 1.16 cents per kwh.

Industrial users buy about 35 per cent of the electricity produced, yet they pay only 23 per cent of the total bill. The boards of directors of America's private utilities are composed of leaders from all the major industrial sectors. One result of the interlocking directorates is a pro-business electricity rate.

In New Hampshire, the Granite State Electric Company charges residents an average of 2.92 cents per kwh and charges industry an average of 2.30, a relatively tolerable difference. Another exception, Kingsport Power in Tennessee, charges residents an average of 1.30 cents per kwh and charges industry 1.01. However, Potomac Edison of Maryland charges residents an average of 2.08 cents kwh, but asks only 0.82 cents from industry; several others are equally discriminatory. Perhaps promotional rates for industry were justified in the days of excess electrical generating capacity, but we will never see those days again.

Scandal Five: If you are in a low or moderate income bracket, the chances are that you are paying about 50 per cent more than the affluent pay for every unit of electricity.

Electricity rates are structured so that the more electricity he uses a month, the less the consumer pays per unit. For example, below are the electricity rates (including adjustments for fuel cost increases (paid by San Francisco Bay Area residents to the Pacific Gas and Electric Co. (PG&E):

Customer Charge—\$0.50.

First 50 kwh—0.0438 per kwh.

Next 50 kwh—0.0338 per kwh.

Next 100 kwh—0.0218 per kwh.

Next 100 kwh—0.0198 per kwh.

Next 700 kwh—0.0188 per kwh.

Over 1,000 kwh—0.0168 per kwh.

The customer charge of fifty cents helps pay for costs of meter-reading and billing; it purchases no electricity. Apply the power company's rate structure to another field, the retail sale of gasoline. A driver might face the following "price schedule" when he pulls into a gas station:

First 5 gallons—70.9 cents ea.

Next 5 gallons—55.9 cents ea.

Next 5 gallons—40.9 cents ea.

All subsequent gallons—30.9 cents ea.

Under such a schedule, the "high volume user" is rewarded through quantity discounts, and he benefits from a lower per-unit charge, on the average, than does the driver of a compact car with a smaller gas tank. Just as this declining price schedule for gasoline clearly discriminates against the small car owner, who may not have the financial ability or the desire to buy a luxury car, the electricity rate structure discriminates against the low-volume electricity consumer.

Our studies indicate that the average inner-city family uses about 200 to 250 kwh per month. The average family (all locations) uses on the order of 500 kwh a month, while many of the more affluent use 1200 kwh or more. We have made some correlation analyses (covering both West Coast and East Coast electricity consumers) and they disclose an extremely close relationship between a family's income and its consumption of electricity.

This stands to reason. If you have a lot of money, you probably keep your air conditioner going much of the time, you probably have a large home to heat and light, and you probably buy the latest energy-guzzling appliances: frost-free refrigerators, deep freezers, self-cleaning ovens, color television, and so on. If you are poor, you may have to do without them.

Under the PG&E rate schedule, a rather typical schedule for electric utilities around the nation, a family using 200 kwh a month pays an average of 3.3 cents for each kwh. But a family using 1200 kwh a month pays, on the average, just 2.1 cents for each kwh.

There is no difference at all between the kwh used by the rich person and the one used by the poor person. Each kwh looks, acts, tastes, smells, and feels just like any other kwh. But the rich person pays less than two-thirds, on the average, of what the poor person pays for each kwh. This amounts to a multi-billion dollar subsidy to the affluent from the low-income group, a huge bonus to the large homeowner from the apartment dweller, and a bonanza to the bond coupon-clippers from the Social Security recipients. It is also a major subsidy to the white race from blacks and other minorities.

Scandal Six: The lower prices for heavy use of electricity are termed "quantity discounts" or "promotional rates" in the electric industry—at least they used to be called that when promoting the use of electricity was socially permissible, before the energy crisis made the headlines.

The public has become conscious of the air pollution caused by power companies. Detroit Edison contributes 75.3 per cent of the total of highly toxic sulfur dioxides which pollute the Wayne County atmosphere each year and 26.4 per cent of the total particulates. Some of this pollution would be curtailed through rate reform which discouraged, rather than encouraged, greater use of electricity.

Some concerned citizens have learned that promotional rates, by artificially stimulating demand for electricity, cause more new generating plants to be constructed than would otherwise be the case. In southeastern Michigan, Detroit Edison is in the midst of a \$7.5 billion plant expansion program, on top of a base of "only" \$2.7 billion. Thus, Edison expects almost to quadruple its plant investment in just one decade to more than \$10 billion, a growth rate which should turn General Motors green with envy. In the Portland, Oregon, area, residential customers will have to pay a large share—about 54 per cent—of the Portland General Electric Co.'s \$752 million new construction program through ever-increasing electricity bills. Over the years it amounts to \$1,167 per residential customer, on the average. If demand were dampened instead of encouraged, fewer new generating plants would be needed, and all ratepayers would gain some rate relief.

So it has not been fashionable, in recent years, openly to promote the use of electricity. In fact, many electric companies have been forced to abandon their huge advertising campaigns, and they now publicly urge their customers to curtail energy consumption.

While the public posture has changed, the use of electricity is promoted as much as ever through the companies' rate schedules. If you stopped a hundred people on the street and asked them what their electricity rate structures looked like, probably not one would know. But people do know that electricity is still cheap enough so that their consumption habits need not be altered in any basic way.

In this sense, the entire energy crisis is a scandal of global proportions. Not only have electric power companies continually promoted wasteful depletion of the resources on which they and we depend, but so have the natural gas companies, the oil and auto companies, plastic firms, steel firms, and all corporations which use up irreplaceable natural resources in their production processes. For the sake of capturing a few extra billion dollars, the corporate giants have elicited the aid of Madison Avenue to steal shiploads of resources from other nations and future generations so that these few generations of affluent Americans can grow content, secure, selfish, and lazy in their disposable society.

It is "economic imperialism," but it is also just plain dumb.

Growth is fundamental to the electricity business. The health of the industry depends on getting and keeping more people hooked on the wonders of electricity. A change in American consumption habits would devastate the electricity pushers. Moreover, the more an electric company is able to increase public demand for electricity, the greater is the need for more generating plants. The new plants swell the rate base, and therefore swell the amount of profits granted to the company by the utility commission, based on the magnitude of the rate base.

The solutions to these six scandals pose monstrous political difficulties, given the status of democracy in this country:

Solution to Scandal One: To keep city people from paying for those new power plants required by the growth in suburban demand, the "service areas" should be reduced. In present service areas, which include cities, suburbs, and fringe areas, everyone shares in paying for the new plant construction costs. Each major city should comprise its own service area, and not have to pay for suburban-generated costs. Better yet, cities should form public utilities, and sell power themselves at relatively inexpensive rates to their residents.

In an October 1974 complaint filed with the local utilities commission, the Washington, D.C., city government noted that D.C. residents required 57 per cent of the Potomac Electric Power Co.'s system generation capability in 1960, but only 42 per cent now. The D.C. government alleges an overcharge of \$12.9 million in the past year alone to D.C. ratepayers who have had to pay, unfairly, for capacity expansion required to accommodate suburban demand. Almost all big cities could take similar action.

Solution to Scandal Two: If the cost-plus system of computing industry profits were junked, companies would lose their incentive to construct nuclear plants. Investment risks should be shifted to the corporation owners: as the nuclear Edsels roll off the line, let the dividends drop.

Solution to Scandal Three: Rate cases, where hearings are held relative to company rate increase requests, can be fairer if the taxpayers are given funds to defend themselves. First, a ceiling should be placed on total expenditures by all parties in rate

cases. Then consumer groups, environmental groups, city, county, and state governments could be allocated funds, at a level that approximates the anticipated power company expenditures in an upcoming rate case, to analyze company rates and growth plans.

Solution to Scandal Four: Let's have no more promotional discount rates for the industrialists. While it is economically justified for residential customers to pay 10 per cent or so more per kwh than do industrial customers, under no circumstances should residents pay two-and-a-half times as much per kwh.

Solutions to Scandals Five and Six: The rational response to the power companies' abuses is an "inverted" rate structure—the more electricity you use, the more you should have to pay per unit. Prices would be reduced for the small user, and increased for the glutton.

As a minimum reform, rates could be made uniform: for example, 2.5 cents for each unit of electricity purchased, regardless of volume. Preferably, the unit price of electricity could increase (instead of decrease) with increased usage, more truly reflecting actual cost conditions.

In attempting to achieve a rate structure reform in Michigan, we took several steps: First, we filed a \$90 million lawsuit against Detroit Edison, alleging price discrimination. The lawsuit was thrown out of court on jurisdictional grounds some months later, but it proved a good attention-getter.

We then prepared about 300 pages of testimony against the rate structures for the local public utilities commission, on behalf of Detroit Model City residents. We were supported in this effort by the Consumers Alliance of Michigan, the United Auto Workers, the City of Detroit, and a number of environmental groups. We were also joined by a few carloads of Model City residents at the Michigan utilities commission rate case hearings in Lansing, this probably was the first time in the commission's history that substantial numbers of minorities and women invaded their country club.

Initially, our testimony was stricken by the commission's hearing examiner, who did not consider it to be the work of "qualified rate engineers." We went back into court on the issue of being heard, and the judge advised, but did not order, the Michigan Public Service Commission to hear us. The commissioners later overruled the examiner, stating that "new kinds of experts" were needed.

We later requested, and were granted, a special session on rate design alone. At that session several professors, consumer advocates, and union people joined us in speaking for rate restructuring.

Led by reform-minded Commissioner William Ralls, the Michigan commission reformed Detroit Edison's rate structure somewhat in April 1972. The high-volume consumers received the total burden of the rate increase, and several millions of dollars were, in essence, transferred from affluent to low-income families.

In the next Detroit Edison rate case, Charles Olson, a University of Maryland economist, submitted testimony for Model City residents and the UAW. Olson is a respected name in the field, among utility people and consumers alike. He spoke the commissioners' language, and he was more acceptable than we could ever be. (He even owned some Edison stock.) Because of his testimony, additional data on some base year costs and electric consumption by income group were ordered by the commission.

In January 1974, as a result of Olson's testimony and the additional data which confirmed all our arguments, Ralls and the other commissioners adopted a totally uniform rate structure for residential consumers.

Quantity discounts were eliminated for the first time in any major electric power company's rate schedules, though a monthly service charge of \$2.10, which purchases no electricity, still retains some of the promotional and discriminatory features of the old rates.

In August 1974, in response to environmentalists' argument, the Wisconsin Public Service Commission ordered a nearly uniform residential electricity rate structure during the summer months for Madison Gas and Electric Co. customers.

We are convinced that any sound testimony encompassing these arguments, and a reference to the precedent set by the Michigan Public Service Commission (case numbers U-3910 and U-4257), submitted by informed consumer groups to a public utility commission, can produce a substantial reform of a local power company's rate structure. The companies' rationalizations for their pollution-generating, growth-inducing, blackout-causing, resource-depleting, price-gouging, poverty-abetting promotional electricity rates cannot withstand a serious and determined attack.

TAX EQUALITY FOR AMATEUR VINTNERS

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1975

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to amend section 5042 of the Internal Revenue Code in order to bring tax equality to the unmarried, widowed, and divorced amateur vintners of our country. This bill simply adds a paragraph to section 5042 to allow persons not the heads of families to produce 100 gallons of wine per year, for personal use and not for sale, without the payment of tax. The law currently allows only the heads of families to produce tax-free wine, an obvious hangover from the era of the prohibition mentality. Justice and equity demand that we end this blatant discrimination against the widows, widowers, divorcees, and single persons who choose to "do-it-themselves" and practice the ageless art of winemaking.

Similar bills have been introduced for years, the last having been incorporated in the ill-fated Tax Reform Act of 1974, after favorable treatment in the Ways and Means Committee. It is time we turned our egalitarian energies toward this matter. This discriminatory provision of the Internal Revenue Code should no longer be a bar to anyone's pursuit of happiness since, as the Bible states: "God made wine to gladden the hearts of men." And who are we mere mortals to try and limit God's beneficence? I respectfully request that my colleagues in the Ways and Means Committee give due consideration to this bill.

The bill follows:

H.R. —

A bill to amend section 5042 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from tax certain wine produced for personal use

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5042 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954

(relating to exemption from tax for certain wines) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(4) WINE FOR PERSONAL USE.—Subject to regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, any duly registered person 18 years of age or older, who is not the head of a family or is not a member of a family the head of which is duly registered for an exemption under paragraph (2) of this subsection, may, without the payment of tax, produce for personal use and not for sale an amount of wine not exceeding 100 gallons per annum."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1974.

ENERGY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 14, 1975

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, Montana Gov. Thomas L. Judge delivered an address on energy to the Western Governor's Conference in Billings on April 2 which merits the attention of every Member of Congress.

While acknowledging that Montana is part of this Nation, and as such has a responsibility to contribute to solution of our energy problems, the Governor makes a forceful case for protection of the State's precious water, clean air, agricultural land base and life style. He rightfully insists that there is much the Nation can do to conserve energy before it rushes to despoil a large fragile area of the West.

The speech gives a flavor of the passionate commitment of Westerners to their land. I hope my colleagues read and heed the plea for fair treatment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this address by Governor Judge be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR THOMAS L. JUDGE TO THE WESTERN GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE ON AGRICULTURE AT THE NORTHERN HOTEL IN BILLINGS, MONTANA, APRIL 1, 1975

When people first crossed into the West, Walter Prescott Webb wrote, they did not immediately realize the imperceptible change that had taken place in their environment, nor, more is the tragedy, did they foresee the full consequences which that change was to bring in their own characters and in their modes of life. . . .

Their plight has been stated in this way: east of the Mississippi civilization stood on three legs—land, water and timber; west of the Mississippi not one but two of these legs were withdrawn—water and timber—and a civilization was left on one leg—land.

Land. We westerners cherish our land. It is the source of our people's livelihoods. It supports the agricultural economies on which so many of our states depend. It grants us seemingly endless space and the freedom to move about as we wish.

Our land has not always and will not always be kind to us. But we can rely upon our land to demand from us our finest intelligence, our most strenuous efforts, our deepest respect.

We in the American West have survived and flourished here. We have made our deserts bloom because we have, at various times in our history, invented new ways of utilizing our resources—new ways of tilling the earth, mining, or employing our limited water supply.

Our people have sought out new ways of doing things because they loved this land and they would not relinquish it.

Today the world is facing two problems—two problems which, while separate in their definitions, are related in their solutions.

Those two problems are of course the energy crisis and the world food shortage. If this nation and the world fail to meet these dual challenges, it could not be considered rhetorical bombast to predict that the four dread horsemen of the Apocalypse would once again visit famine, pestilence, war and death upon the earth. If we fail to meet these challenges, western civilization as we know it may be profoundly altered, and the democratic form of government we have come to revere as man's best hope for self-fulfillment may indeed perish from our midst.

The nation and the world are looking to the western states, to our land, for immediate and longer range solutions to these problems—and not without reason.

Coal is America's most abundant fossil fuel, with recoverable reserves estimated at 1.5 trillion tons representing nearly one third of the known coal in the world. We have enough coal in this country to last us for the next century—even at current growth rates.

Most of the nation's coal, 57 per cent of it or 850 billion tons, is located in the west. Western coal contains lower amounts of sulphur than the coal found on the other side of the Mississippi, and much of it is more cheaply accessible to current mining technologies.

The sixteen western states also account for a significant proportion of the nation's food production. Together we supply nearly four-fifths of the national production of sugar beets and barley; more than half the country's vegetables, fruits and nuts, and sheep; almost half of the wheat and nearly a third of all the cattle.

Well over a third of our total land area is devoted to farms and ranches, which yield \$27 billion a year in cash receipts.

Particularly relevant to our discussion of the relationship between energy development and food production in the west is the fact that we have within our borders two-thirds of all the irrigated land in the United States—twice as much as the rest of the country.

Before addressing the question of what role the western states can realistically play in being part of the solution to these two problems, however, I think we would do well to examine for a moment their beginning. In doing so we may find more answers to the dilemmas facing the world—particularly with respect to the energy shortage—than we will on and under the Great Plains of the Western United States.

With only six per cent of the world's population, we in America have been consuming one third of the world's total energy output—and until recently at a cost of a mere 4 per cent of the Gross National Product.

Other industrialized nations have managed to attain standards of living comparable to ours with far lower per capita energy consumption than ours. Switzerland uses one third and West Germany less than one half what the United States does.

Why do we use so much? Quite simply, we waste it.

Fifty years ago, oil supplied only 14 per cent of America's energy needs, and substantially less than that in other parts of the world. Even as late as 1950, solid fuels accounted for two thirds of our energy consumption.

But by 1970, petroleum and natural gas

were feeding 60 per cent of our total consumption.

Utilities, which in 1960 had used oil for 22 per cent of their needs, were by 1970 using it to produce 80 per cent of their entire electrical output—even though 70 per cent of the original fuel is lost in the production of electricity.

We in this country have wasted fuel because we thought that there was no reason to conserve it. While it remained relatively cheap, we gave no heed to the inevitable and unavoidable fact that its supply is limited, and more severely so by our insatiable and uncontrolled appetite for it. At this moment, we are consuming our fossil fuel reserves at roughly 10 million times their natural rate of creation.

The Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy warned in 1973 that if the growth of energy consumption continued at its then present rate—even if Alaskan oil is developed, if our nation's shale oil reserves are tapped, if our coal reserves are stripped from the earth, if domestic natural gas exploration is promoted, if geothermal plants are developed, if hydroelectric power sources are expanded and if nuclear power plants are built as fast as technology allows—if all these plans become reality—by 1985 we still will have only two thirds the energy supply that this nation will require.

During the Arab Oil Embargo the American people were scarred and they responded by starting to conserve energy. After the embargo was lifted we were lulled back to our old ways of wasting energy again. I don't believe the people of this country are aware of the seriousness of this situation—25 billion American dollars are going out of this country to buy Arab Oil, an increase over last year—dollars that are badly needed in the economy of this country. Domestic production of oil and gas is declining. If we matched the performance of the American made gas guzzling automobile to Europe's or Japanese performance 40% of American oil consumption would be eliminated and the need for imports would be wiped out.

Professor Robert Stobaugh, of the Harvard Business School, appropriately calls U.S. gasoline consumption the hemorrhage of the world oil systems.

Instead of an Administration program of massive coal development in the west and increasing the price of gasoline and diesel fuel, which will work a hardship on agriculture and would cost the average Montana household \$285 per year, increasing the galloping cost of living. I believe that the American public would reduce their use of energy if they realized that the economic security of this country is at stake.

We in this nation became wasteful in our habits because after the post war economic boom got rolling, many of us paid homage to one god and one god only. His name was Growth.

Growth was good; Growth was all encompassing; Growth was all consuming. Substitute Progress for the name Growth and still you were honoring the same deity. Growth meant Progress, and Progress meant Growth.

The beginning of Growth were forgotten and so were assumed not to have been. And certainly Growth would live forever, everyone knew that, providing more individual fulfillment, greater personal satisfaction and infinite peace of mind for all Americans.

Our state of Montana, remote as it is from the nation's population center, was bypassed by the economic expansion of the 1950s and the 1960s. Many of my fellow Montanans developed a kind of inferiority complex about that. They cited personal income statistics which showed our people lagging behind the national average, and they noted that new and expanding industries were not beating down our doors to locate themselves in our state.

While I share some of that concern, and therefore have been working to locate industries in our state which will add value to the products and raw materials we already have, I think Montana did not altogether lose by being left somewhat behind.

We look around us and see great cities brought to their knees by the flight to the suburbs, by rising crime, by decaying housing, by polluted air and water, and by a depression of the spirit which afflicts those who live and work around them.

We in Montana only have to look elsewhere to see the results of unplanned growth. We know what it can do, and we are determined that it not happen to us and to the land for which we are today's caretakers.

The world food problem is due to the vagaries of the weather and to the fact that the rate of increase in global population overtook the rate of increase in food output. In parts of Africa and on the Indian sub-continent, famines of major proportions are endangering the lives of literally hundreds of millions of people.

One out of every three people in the world—a total of 1.3 billion people—lives in a country that does not grow enough food or cannot afford to buy enough from other nations to provide adequate diets for its citizens.

Only seven nations in the world, containing a mere eight per cent of the world's population, grow more than enough food to feed their people. Of these, the United States is by far the largest exporter of food, shipping abroad as much as the other six combined.

But crops in even the most productive areas of the world, which might have aided famine stricken and other developing areas, have been a disappointment. In the United States, for example, drought conditions in the mid-west and in certain western areas, followed by early frost, curtailed production sharply.

Famine has been a scourge on the back of man since the beginning of recorded history. In Europe between the tenth century and the Renaissance, there were 400 widespread famines. In France between 1700 and 1715, a third of the population died. Great Britain, between the tenth and mid-19th Centuries, had 200 famines. And in the last 2000 years the Chinese have faced no less than 1,800 such episodes.

In his State of the Union Address, President Ford this year called for an additional 250 major coal mines, another 150 major coal-fired power plants, and 20 major, new synthetic fuel plants by 1985.

If the President's proposals are found to be necessary and feasible, Montana, like many of your states, will be expected to participate heavily in a national coal-energy development program.

Strip mining would be but one aspect of this program. And we are already experiencing its expanding presence in the life of our state. Between 1968 and 1973 Montana's annual coal production increased over 22 times, to nearly 11 million tons. The Northern Great Plains Resources Program projects the production of as much as 153 million tons by 1985, with most of the coal being shipped out of the state.

Electrical generation would be another part of the coal energy development program. Coal fired power plant capacity in Montana has gone from almost zero several years ago to 1100 Megawatts, applications now pending would more than double that figure. The Western States Water Council has forecast an increase of 8260 Megawatts in our coal generating capacity by 1990, with most of the electricity being transmitted to consumers outside the state.

A third aspect of the administration's program would be the conversion of coal to synthetic fuels. The National Petroleum Coun-

oil has suggested that, under conditions of maximum development, Montana by 1985 may be the site of 14 gasification plants and two liquefaction plants—with most of the products being used out of the state.

The impact of such development on Montana's agriculture, our chief industry, would be resounding.

First, extensive coal development would make significant demands on our land base. The surface that covers 63% of the strippable coal in the West is privately owned by farmers and ranchers who make their living from it. In Montana, 93% of the publicly owned strippable coal lies under privately owned surface; in North Dakota the figure is 100%.

Strippable coal in the Montana portion of the Fort Union Basin underlies 1,131,615 acres, or a land area more than 25 times greater than that occupied by the District of Columbia. Over one-half million acres have been leased for coal mining purposes.

Strippable coal underlies three-quarter million acres of land south of the Yellowstone River. Four per cent of the dry cropland and three per cent of the irrigated land are underlain by strippable coal. Most of the rest of the coal underlies rangeland, the area's most significant agricultural resource. This region of the state supports 28 per cent of our sheep and 20 per cent of our cattle.

These figures, however, concern only the coal which is now considered economically strippable—something less than a tenth of our total coal reserve.

Land that is stripped represents only one portion of the land lost to agriculture through coal energy development. Vast amounts of land may also be needed for generation and conversion plants, transmission lines, railroad spurs, highways, haul roads, aqueducts, and reservoirs. And the population attracted by such development would need additional land for housing, commercial establishments and recreation.

A second, and perhaps more serious, conflict between agriculture and energy development arises over the use of the West's limited and very precious water supply.

In 1972, the Bureau of Reclamation projected that 2.6 million acre feet of the Yellowstone Basin waters might be needed annually for coal development in Montana and Wyoming by the year 2002. By early 1974, less than two years later, filings, options, applications and requests in only the Montana portion of the Basin already totalled half that figure; approaching or exceeding critical low flows, precluding other water use options; and prompting enactment by the 1974 Montana Legislature of the three year moratorium on processing large water applications.

Since passage of the moratorium, some startling figures have been compiled. Wyoming has estimated its share of the Yellowstone's interstate tributaries under the Yellowstone Compact to be 2.4 million acre feet. The Montana Department of Fish and Game, meanwhile, has requested a seven million acre feet reservation at Sidney for instream flow protection.

Taken together, state and private requests total 10.7 million acre feet each year, although the average annual flow of the Yellowstone is only 8.8 million acre feet, with its low flow at 3.7 million acre feet. And none of this considers the projected 631,000 acres in the area to be put under irrigation by the year 2000, requiring an additional 1.6 million acre feet annually. And, other applications continue to be submitted for substantial withdrawals.

The Bureau of Reclamation, now preferring industrial applicants to agricultural users, has already given to corporations the right to more than Yellowstone Reservoir's firm yield of 614,000 acre feet. Recently the

Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation has joined in a law suit against the Bureau of Reclamation over this matter.

If a coal liquefaction plant were built in the area, the strain on the water supply would become even more ridiculous. For each barrel of oil produced, coal liquefaction requires 5.3 barrels of water. As the National Academy of Sciences has prudently warned: "Not enough water for large scale conversion of coal to other energy forms. The potential environmental and social impacts of the use of this water for large scale energy conversion projects would exceed by far the anticipated impact of mining alone." At another time the Academy also said that "... any large scale commitment of water to on-the-spot consumption of coal would lock such states as Montana, Wyoming, and the Dakotas into a coal-based economy they hadn't bargained for."

It is obvious that not all demands for the Yellowstone's water can be satisfied. Competition for this resource will be intense—and could be fatal to the prospect of increasing land under irrigation.

Other problems arising from strip mining the land include disruption of aquifers, saline or alkaline run-off from spoil banks, and trace elements and other emissions from coal-fired plants. And of course land and labor in coal producing areas is being priced out of the range of the agricultural market.

Montana is not alone in witnessing the contest between energy and agriculture. The trade-offs that can be involved throughout the West are illustrated in a carrying capacity analysis of the Colorado River Basin developed at Utah State University. Little or no growth in agricultural production was found in the three alternative future policy orientations projected, since capital and water generally would be allocated to urban and energy development. Under the all-out energy development alternative, the agriculture sector diminished to close to zero by the end of a 30-year period.

Clearly, this bread basket of the nation is in danger of becoming its boiler room. And throughout the nation each year 350,000 acres of farmland—roughly half the size of Rhode Island—is lost to urban development, and another 1.9 million acres—that's about the size of Delaware—is removed from the food production category for highways, airports, flood control, recreation and wilderness.

With the conversion of unused land to farming, our total cropland has remained unchanged at about 470 million acres. The problem is that land lost to urbanization is often of high quality, but one-third of the land available as its replacement is poor or marginal, necessitating higher investments in irrigating and fertilizing. Anhydrous ammonia cost around \$92 per ton before the energy crisis, \$229 a ton now, and, with a 12% shortage predicted by the fertilizer industry, can be expected to become still more expensive.

Agricultural exports have vastly improved America's balance of trade position. But such complications have now led the National Academy of Sciences to question the ability of the nation's farmers to sustain even the American people by the end of the century.

On a larger scale, the world's inability to feed itself is already apparent. Because of malnutrition, over 300 million children now suffer grossly retarded physical growth and development, and many of these have an additional burden of impaired mental development.

Because of its dependence on pesticides, fertilizers, energy, and capital to crop even less appropriate land, the hopes of the Green Revolution have largely been erased. In 1971, John Todd wrote: "... there is the disquiet-

ing feeling [among some biologists and agricultural authorities] that we are witnessing the agricultural equivalent of the launching of the Titanic, only this time there are several billion passengers."

The choice that faces our states and our nation is clear; it must be made; but it is a painful one.

Will we choose to curb our wasteful habits so that we may guarantee our ability to feed ourselves and our children a mere quarter century from now?

Will we make the tough decisions that need to be made to insure the future of our agricultural base?

I am afraid that our fellow citizens across the country take for granted the durability of the agricultural industry. After all, we have not faced a food supply shortage in this country since the Civil War.

"City people have forgotten agriculture," a former chancellor of the University of California at Davis is reported to have said, "and they had better realize that no civilization has survived without it. They need to understand it, to be benevolent toward it, because they need it. No country becomes strong without it or remains strong without it. Apparently when you are too successful in a society, you turn around and destroy it."

We must insure that we will not once again be made victim of the boom and bust cycles that have plagued our extractive economies since we all were territories over a century ago.

The average coal mine is productive for about 35 years. Power and gasification plants have approximately the same life span. When the coal is depleted in a certain area, the mine is closed, related industries move to a new location, and in one brief stroke the economic life and tax base of a community that has schools to support and roads to repair is destroyed.

Will we have at the end a series of dying and ghostly towns spread across the prairie, an Indian community submerged in a white mining culture, and a marginally productive agricultural community?

Will our entire region become as the National Academy of Sciences predicted for parts of our area, a "national sacrifice area"?

No, we will not. We simply will not tolerate such treatment by the federal government and by energy producers.

We must insist that the national government share with us the burden and the responsibility of protecting our communities from the boom and bust spectre, if our people are to be asked once again to make sacrifices for the sake of a national necessity.

An unnamed Gulf Oil Company official was quoted in the December 2, 1973 issue of the Minneapolis Tribune as having said: "The disposition of these deposits of coal will be determined by the economic and social implication of some 150 million megalopoliticians located to the east... providing we still have a representative form of government, then the West's minimal population, with their opinions, hopes, desires about certain tracts of real estate, will be of little or, more probably, of no consequence to the voting majority."

Regardless of the sentiments of this oil company official, the people of the western states will not be treated as second class citizens. This government was established to secure their rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness as such as anyone else's.

While agriculture and energy development compete for some of the basic resources—and and water—there is no question that the future of agriculture depends heavily on energy.

For farm productivity in the United States is capital intensive and energy consumptive. Agriculture is directly dependent on fuel and on fertilizer, the availability of

which is governed by the supply of natural gas.

The challenge that we face is the establishment and enforcement of criteria to insure minimum impact of energy development on our existing and potential agricultural base.

By combining strong state and federal laws and regulations, we must:

1. Assure rapid restoration of damaged rural lands to productivity after resource exploration. Toward that end I urge prompt enactment and approval of the federal strip mine reclamation act.

2. Prohibit exploration if restoration of productivity is not possible. To determine that, adequate studies must be conducted by the state and federal government.

3. Insure that energy development does not preempt water needed for agricultural and human use. The federal government must recognize the state authority to determine water allocations.

4. Assure that existing water supplies are not degraded.

5. Oppose federal preemption of the states authority in water, land use, utility siting and clear air and water standards.

6. Provide federal funds for front end money to communities impacted by resource development—for planning, housing, education, roads, social services, and law enforcement.

To address these and other problems on a regional basis the governors of ten western states have formed the Western Governors' Regional Energy Policy Office located in Denver, Colorado. With funds from the Old West and Four Corners Regional Commission we intend to develop a Regional Energy Policy. Instead of reacting to federal mandates we intend to formulate policies and recommendations to the Administration and the Congress on all energy issues affecting the Western States.

It is vital that the governors of the western states develop policy affecting our number one industry agriculture. It is obvious that there is little understanding or concern in Washington about the problems facing farmers and ranchers.

The beef cattle industry is suffering the worst depression since the 30's and yet the country continues to import tremendous quantities of foreign beef.

The target price of wheat is unrealistically low, during a time when production costs are at an all time high and yet the USDA opposes increasing support prices.

There is little or no recognition in Washington about the serious losses incurred by the sheep industry because of predators.

Rural people are suffering from inadequate health care, a drastic shortage of housing and primary and secondary roads are in shameful condition. Programs to assist rural areas such as the Rural Development Act, Farmers Home Administration and the Emergency Loan Act have been greatly underfunded and even more cuts are proposed.

The rural areas of the west have been and are being shortchanged by the federal government yet it is the rural western states that this country and the world look to for food and energy.

The time has come when the governors of the west must exert the leadership to take our rightful place among the states.

The Western Governors' Conference on Agriculture, which has attracted the best minds in government and the private sector, and the Western Governor's Regional Energy Policy Office are both steps in that direction.

For the past 35 years the people of this country have looked to Washington for the solutions to their problems. In recent years we have seen the solutions coming out of Washington are too little, too late.

As we enter the 3rd century of our nation's history, I predict that the people will be

looking, not east, but west. Not to the Federal government but to the States, for the leadership this country so badly needs. In adopting stringent reclamation and environmental protection laws, in enacting sweeping tax reform and other measures, the states have shown themselves to be far more knowledgeable about and responsive to their peoples' problems.

The Governors of the west, by working closely with our congressional delegations, can represent the most significant political block since the southern states taught us how such things are done.

The people of Montana and the west will do all in their power to supply the real energy needs of this nation, and the food needs of the world. But we will not do so at the cost of the permanent destruction of our states and the way of life that is our heritage and our future.

Bob Bailey, a Northern Cheyenne from Montana, posed to fellow tribesmen faced with the decision of whether to develop the coal under their land, the dilemma that all Americans must confront:

"The question is," he said, "do we perpetuate ourselves or do we extinguish ourselves? The very land we stand on, sleep on, eat on, will be torn up. This is our last piece of land, and if we lose it, we'll be Indians without lands in the future . . ."

The time is long past due when we, the descendants of those who came to this country over the course of the last few centuries, recognize the wisdom of the people who were here before us. They revered and respected nature. They realized that they could not live apart from nature, but only within it.

As Joseph Kinsey Howard wrote in 1943, "The Indian hates waste. He will show you no more than he must. For a generation he has watched you and your kind plundering the northern plains; he has learned that the more a white man sees, the more he seizes—and that what the white man takes he uses briefly and wantonly casts aside. . . ."

"The Indian didn't expect any coddling. Nature did her part by offering her products to him freely; it was up to him to find the uses to which they might be put—without waste, and with respectful regard for her whims."

If for the sake of feeding an inflated national appetite for energy, we decide to destroy our land, to consume and pollute our limited supply of water, to ravage our communities, we will have sealed the doom, not only of our own people, but also of all people who look to us for increased production of food. As Chief Seattle said so many decades ago, "The earth does not belong to man, man belongs to the earth."

I am confident that the actions we decide jointly to take as a result of this conference will reflect a new understanding by modern man of this timeless truth, which until recently, has been ignored for so long.

Thank you.

THE 100TH BIRTHDAY FOR MRS.
MALISSIA HAMNER

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1975

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues to join me in wishing the happiest of birthdays to a remarkable woman in Cleveland's black community who has attained the age of 100 years.

Mrs. Malissia Hamner celebrated a century of life on March 7, 1875.

Mrs. Hamner is well-known in the community, having enjoyed a long and satisfying career as a teacher in the Cleveland Public Schools. Her late husband, William H. Hamner died in 1937. The Hamners were blessed with a family of four sons, George, John, William, and Felton, and two grandchildren, Mamie and Arthur.

I ask my colleagues to join me in sending sincere congratulations and many happy returns to Mrs. Malissia Hamner on this wonderful occasion.

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE OF SENATOR LEE METCALF TO THE MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1975

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, from my service on the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, I have derived my pleasures, but few have equaled the satisfaction I have enjoyed in working with the distinguished Senator from Montana, LEE METCALF.

Senator METCALF's service with the Commission is truly remarkable. He leaves the Commission with the deep gratitude and thanks of conservationists throughout the Nation.

On the occasion of Senator METCALF's departure, the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission released this statement of appreciation concerning Senator METCALF's contributions, which I submit for the Record.

THE MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION LOSES A DISTINGUISHED MEMBER, SENATOR LEE METCALF, OF MONTANA

A truly remarkable display of devotion to the natural resource preservation cause is Senator Lee Metcalf's membership on the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission over the past fourteen years.

This Commission operates under authority of the 1929 Migratory Bird Conservation Act to rule on land acquisition proposals of the Secretary of the Interior on behalf of migratory birds. The Commission is composed of two Senators, two Congressmen, and the Secretaries of Agriculture, Transportation and Interior, the latter acting as its chairman.

Except for about a year's interruption in 1969-70, Senator Metcalf has served continuously on the Commission from 1961 to several months ago, when he found it necessary to relinquish membership. During his service, he compiled the astounding record of never having missed a single one of its 50 meetings while bestowing his counsel and wisdom on deliberations of the Commission.

His membership spanned a crucial period in the Commission's history. Except for his short time of absence, these years nearly coincide with an accelerated land acquisition program designed to grasp still existing opportunities to preserve fast disappearing habitat crucial to the welfare of the nation's waterfowl. During this time the Commission has decided on the purchase of 525,000 acres of land and has overseen creation of 43 new

waterfowl refuges as well as additions to many others.

Always tenacious in his beliefs in the work of the Commission, he has been the friend of all who are troubled about the future of waterfowl, whether for hunting or just plain enjoyment. He has set the standard for purposefulness toward achieving a system of federal land holdings which would mesh with State and private habitats to maintain traditional waterfowl populations across the land.

Senator Metcalf deserves the gratitude of not only sportsmen, but anyone interested in the world of wildlife and the natural environment. His efforts should not go unnoticed.

TRIBUTE TO LT. COMDR. PAUL WORRELL

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1975

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, on April 18, Lt. Comdr. Paul Worrell will be 33 years old. Unfortunately, Paul will not be celebrating his birthday with loved ones because, he, along with 1,325 other men, are still listed as missing in action in Vietnam.

I am deeply disturbed about the President's delay and inaction in exerting a greater effort to locate MIAs and POWs in Southeast Asia. For this reason, I, and several of my colleagues, have cosponsored House Resolution 356, which would establish a select committee composed of 10 Members of the House to study the problem of U.S. servicemen missing in action.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to Lieutenant Commander Worrell on his birthday by inserting into the RECORD the following:

TRIBUTE TO LT. COMDR. PAUL WORRELL BY HIS MOTHER

Paul was born April 18, 1942. He lived all of his life in Philadelphia. He attended Temple University and graduated with an Associates Degree in Technology. He was on the Dean's list.

Paul is still listed as Missing in Action along with 1325 other men whose names did not appear on any list at the time the Peace Agreement was signed. Paul flew off the carrier Franklin D. Roosevelt. He was on a night mission over North Vietnam flying a single seater A-4 Skyhawk. On December 2, 1964 he soloed and on December 2, 1966, exactly two years later, his plane was shot down.

Paul loved life and people. Everyone liked him from age 6 to 60. Everyone was his friend. Paul started delivering a Philadelphia paper at the age of 12 and when he was 16 he started working in a supermarket and through this, he earned enough money to pay his way through college. He also bought a car, which is every boys dream—it was a junker, but he loved it—it was all his, and he had paid for it.

Paul's big thrill was to bring home little treats for the family on pay day. His biggest worry when he went into the service was, now his father would have to shovel snow and cut the grass. He wanted to buy his father a riding mower, but we would not hear of it. How happy he would be if he only knew that we now have a riding mower.

We have a married daughter, and three grandchildren, all in their teens. Our daughter Judy misses her brother very much. They

had their battles while growing up, all children do, but when they grew older, they became very close.

Please keep Paul and all our missing men in your prayers.

YOUTH CAMP SAFETY ACT

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1975

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am today circulating a "Dear Colleague" letter announcing my intention to offer a substitute to H.R. 46, the Youth Camp Safety Act, which is scheduled for floor action on Wednesday of this week. I have today filed the text of my amendment in the nature of a substitute with the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and it will appear in the "amendments" section in the back of the House portion of today's RECORD.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I include the text of the "Dear Colleague" letter, a summary of my substitute, and a comparative summary of the committee bill and my substitute. I commend these items to the careful reading of my colleagues and solicit their support for my substitute. The materials follow:

FLOOR ACTION WEDNESDAY: YOUTH CAMP SAFETY

DEAR COLLEAGUE: At the appropriate time during House consideration of the "Youth Camp Safety Act," I intend to offer a substitute aimed at meeting most, though not all, of the Administration's objections to H.R. 46. Specifically, my substitute would limit Federal involvement to the promulgation of model youth camp safety standards and a three-year grant program to encourage States to develop, implement and enforce a youth camp safety program at least as effective as the model Federal standards. A summary of my substitute is on the back of this letter; the text of the substitute is contained in the amendments section of the Monday, April 14th Congressional Record.

I have very serious reservations about the constitutionality and advisability of H.R. 46 which provides for the direct Federal regulation of practically all manner of organized youth activities apart from the home or school, in those States which do not adopt a Federally approved youth camp safety program. It is my strong feeling that youth camp safety should remain primarily the responsibility of the States which can most effectively develop and enforce youth camp safety standards suited to the unique and diverse conditions within their jurisdictions. H.R. 46, on the other hand, would create a form of junior-OSHA manned by a Federal Kiddle Camp Cop Corps to police those camps in States which do not have Federally approved plans. Not only would the new Office of Youth Camp Safety have authority to freely inspect, fine and even close-down traditional summer camps, but it would also, under the bill's broad definition of youth camps, have jurisdiction over organized hiking, cycling, sailing and ski activities for young people; motorized transportation outings; vacation Bible schools; community summer recreation programs; athletic clinics; and so-called "stay at home camps." As the committee report makes clear (p. 3): "It is the Committee's intent, under the definition of day

camps, that the Committee means to include those organized activities which take place apart from the home, and are scheduled on an organized and regular basis." The only exception to this under the bill is day care centers.

My substitute, on the other hand, would limit the definition of youth camp to those camps advertised or promoted as such, operating on a permanent camp site as the term is generally understood, under the auspices of a profit or non-profit entity, conducted for ten or more children under 18, for a period of, or portions of, five or more consecutive days in one or more seasons of the year. My substitute authorizes the same amount of grant assistance to States over a three-year period as would the committee bill, \$22.5 million, but whereas the committee bill contains authorizations for an indefinite period, my bill clearly terminates the grant program after three-years—thus providing States sufficient time and funding to initiate their own program, without promising to subsidize them forever. Whereas my bill provides States an incentive through plan development assistance grants, the committee bill provides no assistance until after a plan is approved. Thus the committee bill is a disincentive for States to even develop a plan, thereby insuring Federal preemption. Finally, my bill eliminates the costly and unnecessary advisory councils and authorizes the Secretary of HEW to establish a Bureau of Youth Camp Safety within HEW, rather than imposing a semi-autonomous Office of Youth Camp Safety on the Office of the Secretary. I urge you to support my substitute.

Very truly yours,

JOHN B. ANDERSON,
Member of Congress.

SUMMARY OF ANDERSON YOUTH CAMP SAFETY ACT SUBSTITUTE

Section 1. Title: "Youth Camp Safety Act."

Section 2. Purpose: To safeguard and protect the well-being of young persons in youth camps by developing Federal model youth camp safety standards and by providing technical and financial assistance to States to encourage them to develop and implement their own youth camp safety programs.

Section 3. Bureau of Youth Camp Safety: The Secretary of HEW is authorized to establish within the Department a Bureau of Youth Camp Safety to assist him in administering the Act and to make other expert HEW personnel available to States to assist them with the development of their programs.

Section 4. Promulgation of Model Youth Camp Safety Standards: Within six months after the date of enactment, the Secretary shall promulgate model youth camp safety standards after consultation with appropriate State officials and public and private organizations.

Section 5. Federal Grant Assistance to States: There are authorized to be appropriated \$7.5 million in fiscal 1976, \$10-million in fiscal 1977, and \$5-million in fiscal 1978, to be made available under the following grant categories: State Plan Development Assistance Grants—\$1-million in fiscal 1976; Plan Initiation and Training Grants—\$4-million in fiscal 1976, and \$5-million in fiscal 1977; and Early Operation and Improvement Grants—\$2.5-million in fiscal 1976, \$5-million in fiscal 1977, and \$5-million in fiscal 1978. Of the latter two categories of grants, the Federal share could not exceed 50% of the costs related to those purposes in the year in which the grant is made.

Section 6. State Youth Camp Safety Plans: For States to qualify for the latter

two categories of grants, State plans would have to be approved by the Secretary. The State plans would have to be as effective as the Federal standards and contain certain additional assurances as to adequate personnel, funding and enforcement.

Section 7. Reports: States having approved plans would be required to file an annual report with the Secretary on the incidence of serious injuries, illnesses and deaths in camps under their jurisdiction. The Secretary would be required to file an annual report with the President and Congress on activities being carried out under the Act and including a summary of injury, illness and death statistics collected.

Section 8. Miscellaneous: Contains curriculum non-interference clause, medical exemptions on religious grounds, and non-

interference clause on existing rights, laws, duties and liabilities of camp operators and campers with respect to injuries, diseases or death of campers in connection with camp activities.

Section 9. Definitions: "Youth camp" means any camp advertised or promoted as such, operating on a permanent camp site as the term is generally understood, under the auspices of a profit or non-profit entity, conducted for ten or more children under the age of 18, for a period, or portions of, five or more consecutive days in one or more seasons of the year.

Section 10. Effective Date: Date of enactment.

Section 11. Termination Date: The grant assistance program shall terminate on June 30, 1978. It is the intent of the Congress

that the program shall not be extended or renewed and that States desiring to participate shall take appropriate action within the three-year time period set for in the Act. The Secretary's annual report on January 1, 1979, shall include a separate section summarizing the three-year operation of the program, including a list of participating States operating under approved plans, and a compilation of the injury, illness and death statistics compiled for the period. The Secretary shall include in this section such conclusions and recommendations as he deems appropriate based on his findings. Notwithstanding the termination date above, the Secretary shall continue to provide technical assistance to states which request it, as may be within the capability of the Department.

COMPARATIVE SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE YOUTH CAMP SAFETY BILL (H.R. 46) AND THE ANDERSON SUBSTITUTE
COMMITTEE BILL (H.R. 46) ANDERSON SUBSTITUTE

"Youth Camp Safety Act."	1. Title Same.
To protect and safeguard health and well-being of young persons at camps through Federal safety standards, technical and financial assistance to States to develop safety programs, and Federal enforcement in States without approved plans.	2. Purpose Same except no Federal enforcement in States without approved plans.
Creates an Office of Youth Camp Safety in office of Secretary of HEW; director appointed by Secretary.	3. Administration Authorizes creation of Bureau of Youth Camp Safety within HEW to assist Secretary in administration of Act, and makes other expert HEW personnel available to assist States with safety programs.
Director, with approval of Secretary, promulgates safety standards within six months of enactment. Standards take effect one year after enactment.	4. Safety Standards Secretary promulgates model safety standards within six months.
Requires camp operators to provide campers with safe and healthful conditions, facilities and equipment free from recognized hazards which cause or are likely to cause death, serious illness, or serious physical harm, and adequate and qualified instruction and supervision of camp activities.	5. General Duty No general duty section.
Sets criteria for States to operate their own approved plans. Director would approve plans. Opportunity for hearing on disapproval decision.	6. State Plans Sets similar criteria. Secretary would approve plans. Hearing afforded on disapproval decision.
Director shall make grants to States having approved plans. No annual grant levels set. Bill authorizes \$7.5-million per year indefinitely.	7. Grants to States & Authorizations Establishes three-year grant program: \$7.5-million in fiscal 1976, \$10-million in fiscal 1977, and \$5-million in fiscal 1978. Secretary makes grants under three categories: State Plan Development Assistance Grants—\$1-million in fiscal 1976; Plan Initiation and Training Grants—\$4-million in fiscal 1976, \$5-million in fiscal 1977; and Early Operation and Improvement Grants—\$2.5-million in fiscal 1976, \$5-million in fiscal 1977, and \$5-million in fiscal 1978.
Director shall provide consultative services upon request of any camp operator, director or staff, or during any inspection. Director may issue notice of apparent serious violation of duty or standards while on consultative or inspection visit, setting reasonable period of time for abatement. Upon return, Director may issue citation setting additional time for abatement or may assess civil penalty. Opportunity for hearing on citation or penalty is afforded as are appeals through courts of appeals. Director's authority to issue citations and penalties only applicable in States without approved plans.	8. Consultative Services & Enforcement No comparable provision.
"In order to carry out duties under this Act, the Director may enter and inspect any youth camp, its records, may question employees, and may investigate facts, conditions, practices, or matters to the extent he deems necessary or appropriate." Director given authority to require attendance and testimony of witnesses and production of evidence under oath. The above authority seems to apply to all States, including those with approved plans. States with approved plans would file camp injury, illness and death statistics with Director. Camps in States without approved plans would file reports directly with Director.	9. Inspections, Investigations & Records No comparable provision.
Camp operators failing to correct violation for which notice or citation is issued may be assessed civil penalty of up to \$500 a day for each day violation continues; willful or repeated violations subject to maximum penalty of \$1,000 a day, paid to the Director for deposit into U.S. Treasury. States with approved plans may either assess penalties or take away State certification. Director may take civil action in U.S. district court to recover civil penalties.	10. Penalties No Federal enforcement or penalty authority. States with approved plans must either provide penalties or certification and loss of certification system.

COMPARATIVE SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE YOUTH CAMP SAFETY BILL (H.R. 46) AND THE ANDERSON SUBSTITUTE—Continued
COMMITTEE BILL (H.R. 46)—Continued

ANDERSON SUBSTITUTE—Continued

11. Procedures to Counteract Imminent Dangers

U.S. district courts given jurisdiction, upon petition of Director, to restrain any camp conditions or practices which pose danger of death or serious physical harm before regular enforcement procedures are employed. Language not clear here as to whether Director's authority applies to all States or only to those without approved plans.

No comparable provision.

12. Variations

Director, upon application of camp owner, may approve variation in standards if alternative is as effective.

No comparable provision.

13. Advisory council on youth camp safety

The Director shall establish in HEW an Advisory Council on Youth Camp Safety to advise and consult on policy matters, particularly the promulgation of standards. Council shall consist of Director, to serve as chairman, and 15 members appointed by him, including representatives of Depts. of HEW, Ag and Labor, and 8 persons from appropriate associations representing organized camping. Director may appoint special advisory and technical experts and consultants. Members of Advisory Council, while serving on business shall receive compensation up to \$100 per day.

No comparable provision. Secretary would be required to consult with appropriate State officials and public and private organizations in promulgating standards.

14. Miscellaneous

Director may request directly from any Federal department or agency information, suggestions, estimates and statistics needed to carry out his functions under this Act, and such departments and agencies are authorized to furnish the materials requested.

Secretary may request same.

No one acting under this Act may restrict, determine or influence camp curriculum, program or ministry.

Same.

Nothing in this Act shall authorize required medical treatment for those who object on religious grounds.

Same.

Nothing under this Act shall be construed to supersede, enlarge or diminish existing rights, duties or liabilities of camp operators or campers with respect to injuries, diseases or death of campers in connection with camp activities.

Same.

Director is required to file an annual report to Congress and President on January 1 of each year on activities carried out under this Act, including statistics collected on camp injuries, illnesses and deaths.

Secretary is required to file same report. In addition, at the end of the three-year grant program, the Secretary's annual report shall include a separate section on the operation of the program over the three-year period, including a compilation of statistics collected and any conclusions and recommendations Secretary may deem appropriate on the basis of his findings.

15. Definitions

"Youth camp" means any residential camp, day camp, troop camp, travel camp, trip camp, primitive or outpost camp, or Federal recreational youth camp on public or private land, and activities promoted or advertised as a youth camp regardless of programs advocated, and shall also include any site or facility primarily designed for other purposes, such as, but not limited to, any school, playground, resort, wilderness area, or Government land, which is conducted for ten or more campers under 18 years of age. Special definitions for each of the above types of camps are included.

"Youth camp" means any camp advertised or promoted as such, operating on a permanent camp site as the term is generally understood, under the auspices of a profit or non-profit entity, conducted for ten or more children under the age of 18, for a period, or portions of, five or more consecutive days in one or more seasons of the year.

16. Termination of date

None.

The grant assistance program shall terminate on June 30, 1978. It is the intent of Congress that the program shall not be extended or renewed and that States wishing to participate shall do so within the three-year time period set forth in the Act.

WARREN BRYANT—BLACK STAR
ON THE RISE

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1975

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce my colleagues to a very talented young entertainer who has become the pride of Cleveland's black community. Warren Bryant is a rising singing star who, like many now famous black singers, began his career with his church choir. Bryant toured the Southern and Eastern States with the choir of the Lane Metropolitan C.M.E. Church of Cleveland, and continued to sing in the Lane Ensemble after his successful nightclub

debut. He has since appeared as a soloist in many local nightclubs, but despite the rugged demands on a young performer breaking into show business, Warren has always found time to sing with the ensemble and to donate his considerable talents to numerous civic and social organizations in Cleveland's black community. Among his many guest appearances have been the Forest City Hospital Building Fund Benefit and the West African Relief Fund Benefit at Cleveland's East Technical High School. He has also been one of the most active young members of the 21st District Congressional Caucus.

His highly trained voice is not Mr. Bryant's only great accomplishment. He recently graduated from Cleveland State University with a degree in sociology. He

was also voted one of Cleveland's best-dressed young men.

I am proud to acquaint my colleagues with this multitalented and civic minded young Clevelander, for whom we all expect a great future in the entertainment world.

MILTON S. KRONHEIM, SR.—HUMANITARIAN, COMPASSIONATE MAN, AND NOBLE FRIEND

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1975

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, Milton S. Kronheim, Sr., of Washington, D.C., was

honored recently for his philanthropic efforts by some of his many friends, who range from a distinguished professional football coach, to an Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Some persons are so outstanding, it is almost impossible to find the right adjectives to describe them. Milton S. Kronheim, Sr. is one of those rare persons. The closest I came to finding the words that could come close to describing him was something written by Edwin Markham in his poem, "Brotherhood." In that fine poem, Markham wrote:

The crest and crowing of all good,
Life's final star, is brotherhood.

Mr. Speaker, all his life, Milton S. Kronheim, Sr. has not only advocated brotherhood—he has lived it, because he believes in brotherly love. He cares about people. In fact, he loves them, not only as individuals, but as part of mankind.

At the reception recently held in Milton Kronheim's honor, there were some expressions made that came a little closer to describing that remarkable and beloved man:

Washington, D.C. Mayor Walter Washington said:

He has contributed to every cause that has been meaningful in this city. In the dark days of racial trouble, Milt didn't ask me to write him a memorandum, or ask for a justification, or send me a proposal. He just asked, what do you want me to do? He's a humanitarian, and that's the measure of the man.

And at the end, Associate Supreme Court Justice William J. Brennan, Jr., called Mr. Kronheim:

My noble friend, a wholly compassionate man, a truly delightful, inspiring, and stimulating companion.

Mr. Speaker, these tributes were only two of the many spoken at the reception and although they are most appropriate, the great philanthropic work done by Milton S. Kronheim, Sr. is the best tribute of all.

I remember reading something written by Edmund Gosse that also reminds me of Milton Kronheim:

I only wish to live my life and find,
My heart in unison with all mankind.

Mr. Speaker, Milton Kronheim's heart is definitely "in unison with all mankind." I am proud and honored to call him a great and cherished friend.

The Washington Post published a story on Monday, April 14, 1975, covering the reception held in Milton Kronheim's honor, and it is inserted in the Record with the hope that those who read the Record will know about this great humanitarian:

CHEERS: KRONHEIM GOES TO BAT
(By Jacqueline Trescott)

Milton S. Kronheim Sr. was standing in a corner of the Woodmont Country Club sheepishly absorbing all the fuss about him. Once again the 86-year-old business tycoon was being honored for his philanthropic efforts, but once again everyone was talking about his athletic prowess.

You see, Milton plays handball six times a week at the Central Y, just Saturday had won two games and is avidly looking for spring to settle in and baseball to begin. He's a pitcher with "a hell of a right arm," according to a friend who teasingly calls him the Jewish Satchel Paige. Because of

his stamina and his prime rod-straight physique, men are frankly envious of his energies.

Even men who have their own power realm go out of their way to spend time with Kronheim.

William Brennan, associate justice of the Supreme Court, sat next to Kronheim at Saturday night's dinner, and commented, "David Bazelon, Thurgood Marshall and I can our way onto his guest list at least twice a week. Milton's cuisine excels."

Invitations to lunch, either at his liquor distribution company's warehouse on V Street NE or at his famous Saturday afternoon roundtable, are coveted. Judge John Sirica, who sat on Kronheim's other side, is a frequent guest. "We met in February, 1927," Sirica said. "In the old days everything at police court finished at noon. Milt had a haberdashery near the court and we would go to the Jewish Community Center at 16th and Q. We would put on boxing gloves. Once I gave him a black eye and his wife said, 'Milt, why don't you stop playing with that little Italian.'"

As his friends reminisced, Kronheim pulled back his head and laughed heartily, his firm, parchment-lined hands tucked into the black eyelet lace vest of his tuxedo. Once or twice, he asked that the endless shower of praise be cut short, but the telegrams from President Gerald Ford, Sen. Jacob Javits and Gov. Marvin Mandel were all dutifully read.

The evening, also a fund-raising event for the Jewish Social Service Agency, included a musical treat. Making its international debut was the Milton S. Kronheim Quartet—its talent drawn from the National Symphony, with solo violinist and concert master Miran Kojian and Jacqueline Anderson of the NSO on viola, and from an outfit dubbed the "3210 R St. NW Strictly No Refund String Combo," with violinist and former Supreme Court Justice Abe Fortas and attorney Albert Feigen.

Clutching the violin that Isaac Stern had given him, Fortas said, "only my love for Milton could bring me to this moment." The quartet played Haydn and Mozart.

Before the evening was over, Kronheim had received a football from Redskins coach George Allen, and a plaque from Eddie Rosenblum of the Potomac Valley Amateur Athletic Association, had heard attorney Milton King paraphrase "Kronheim At the Bat" and had endorsed, in his name, a scholarship loan fund for the "outstanding high school pitcher in the District."

Mayor Walter Washington, who officially declared the day in Kronheim's name, related the tributes to Kronheim's generosity. "He has contributed to every cause that has been meaningful in this city," Washington said. "In the dark days of racial trouble, Milt didn't ask me to write him a memorandum or ask for a justification or send me a proposal. He just asked what do you want me to do. He's a humanitarian and that's the measure of the man."

At the end, Justice Brennan expressed many of the thoughts of the 350 people honoring Kronheim by calling him, "my noble friend, a wholly compassionate man, a truly delightful, inspiring and stimulating companion."

IMPACT FUNDS NEEDED FOR OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF DEVELOPMENT

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1975

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, through the discussion of legislation con-

cerning the Interior Department's proposal to develop America's Outer Continental Shelf, the interest in the Congress has heightened and more Members are becoming aware of impact which will inevitably fall upon the States adjacent to this development.

I am introducing a bill intended to assist both the coastal States and the Nation in dealing with the impact arising from OCS development. The bill addresses three areas designed to: First. Provide a fund to distribute grants to coastal States in compensation for immediate impact; Second. Provide revenue shares to coastal States as compensation for production impact; and Third. Provide revenue shares to all States for use in dealing with the nationwide energy problem on a State-by-State basis.

While a recent Supreme Court decision settled the question of coastal State ownership of the OCS, it did not relieve the Federal Government from its responsibility for impact compensation to these States resulting from OCS development.

Such impact is inevitable. Historic evidence of this fact can be found in the impact occurring from construction of the Alaska pipeline which has been particularly felt in the Alaska cities of Fairbanks and Valdez. The study conducted by the Council on Environmental Quality additionally cites the severe risks of development in the Gulf of Alaska due to unique environmental conditions.

Small communities which dot the coastline of Alaska will experience impact greater than anything they have witnessed in the past. The city of Yakutat has felt initial impact as several oil companies have acquired land for use as on-shore sites and as research is conducted to ascertain OCS reserves.

Interior is forging ahead with its lease schedule. It, therefore, behooves the Congress to act now to protect coastal State interests and clear the way for timely development of our OCS oil and gas reserves. If we fail to act now, these States will have no alternative but to impede development through endless litigation.

The same arguments which rationalize revenues to States from development of public lands under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 can be applied to the OCS development program.

Coastal States will undertake a significant burden through the contribution of services to manpower required in the program, the acceptance of onshore facilities, and bearing the risks of oil spills inherent with the program.

These risks are particularly keen in frontier areas such as Alaska. The risks may be outweighed by the need for additional energy supplies, but we can and must be prepared to contend with all forms of impact through the course of OCS development.

The legislation which I propose would insure equity in the development of our OCS resources. Coastal States would have the funds necessary to ameliorate the impact arising from such development and would be in a position to assist the Nation in the exploitation of this additional supply of domestic petroleum.

Recognizing that the energy situation confronting the United States impacts the citizens of all States, I have also pro-

vided revenue shares from OCS development to each State on the basis of population. These funds could be used to deal with energy problems unique to each State.

"SPIRIT OF '76"

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1975

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I recently solicited entries for my annual high school essay contest for senior students in the 26th Congressional District of New York. I thought it appropriate that the contest have as its theme for this year, Spirit of '76.

The essays which won honorable mention in the contest were written by Frederick Probst, a senior at Nyack High School, Nyack, N.Y., and Ms. Nancy Davidson of the senior class of the Monroe-Woodbury High School in Central Valley, N.Y.

Mr. Speaker, these essays reveal feelings of deep pride and hope for the future of our Nation. Because the essays were so thoughtful and articulated the feelings of these young people so well, I would like to share them with my colleagues and ask that they be printed in full in this portion of the RECORD:

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE BICENTENNIAL

(By Nancy Davidson)

Within the year, great emphasis will be placed on celebrating the bicentennial in an 'appropriate' manner. In an era of widespread poverty and world wide hunger, literally millions of dollars will be spent to honor the occasion. Thousands of citizens will devote their money, time, and effort for this celebration.

The bicentennial's festivities will not be the center of attention for everyone. Some believe it will merely be a political and social extravaganza. Others believe that it will feebly attempt to bolster American confidence, by showing the world that we still have great wealth and splendor. For some people, it will be an escape from daily problems and frustrations.

I think that the bicentennial ought to be an important occasion, for a very fundamental reason. It will be a time that the entire nation can be united; for each one of us plays an integral part in the machinery of our nation. In an extremely simplistic sense, it ought to be a pep rally for ourselves as individuals; ourselves as a nation, and most importantly, it ought to be a pep rally for all of mankind. I can't think of any other country that cradles so many differing life styles, beliefs and values. Our nation is truly a melting pot.

The bicentennial also ought to be a time for reflection. Despite the fact that we are a young nation, America is rich in its heritage. As we glorify our heroes, we ought to remember our mistakes as well. We have made errors; we have suffered; we have learned from these experiences.

Today, our future is uncertain. We draw from our heritage for many of the answers. Like our forefathers, we, the people hold the strings of power, the strings of our future.

SPIRIT OF '76

(By Frederick J. Probst, Jr.)

"We are the sons of freedom," decreed the townspeople of Farmington, Connecticut, on May 19, 1774. This moment was to be typical

of the spirit and unity shown in the United States of America for the next two hundred years.

The English colonies revealed a sort of new nationality sometime after the Seven Years War. They themselves did not realize their potential until the first act of colonial union in 1765 with the Stamp Act Congress denouncing the British tax. Before this time, individual colonies had asserted themselves in an effort to express their discontent. The Sons of Liberty in Boston in 1765 were such a group. The Virginia Resolves were an assemblage of claims to the "inalienable rights of Englishmen" to be transferred to immigrants, thereby making all those in the colonies able to exercise the rights of those in the mother country.

Prophetic were the words of George III when he said, "The die is now cast; the colonies must either submit or triumph." That they did and I feel that this is what has kept our country together for the last two hundred years, the power through unity, the dedication to the "American way," the willingness to find solutions to our problems, the American spirit. This is what will hold our country together for the next two hundred years, the Spirit of '76. This is what we will remember on the nation's two hundredth anniversary, and this is what we will continue to believe in.

NATIONAL SOLIDARITY DAY

HON. LEO C. ZEFERETTI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1975

Mr. ZEFERETTI. Mr. Speaker, for 20 centuries the Jewish people have known a persecution that poisoned the collective heritage of the entire Western World. A noted Jewish scholar has recently referred to it as "the great hatred." Antisemitism knows no boundary of time or distance. Like an endless pestilence, it survives generations and afflicts people who are removed from one another in time and place.

From the Dark Ages and the Crusades to the Inquisition and the Dreyfus case—from Hitler's gas chambers to Stalin's prison camps—from Henry Ford's publication of the Protocol of the Elders of Zion and Father Caughlin to the Ku Klux Klan and the American Nazi Party; everywhere the Jewish people turn, they find this living horror confronting them.

In the days of the Romanoff czars, the Jewish people knew pogroms in Russia. Today, there is another kind of persecution. Yet, the strain that ran through Russian history yesterday is omnipresent in Russian policy; hatred and persecution of those who are devoted to their Jewish faith and culture.

Such an outrage is as unacceptable as it is reprehensible, and to those who offer the feeble excuse that America should not interfere in Russia's internal affairs, I respond that liberty, free ideals, and religious faith know no boundaries and accept no hindrance. If America represents anything, she stands for the ideal that all men are equal before the eyes of God, and are entitled to lead personal lives of their own choosing.

It is the responsibility of non-Jews to

stand up as men and women of conscience, to protest what is being done to the Jewish people today in the Soviet Union. It is incumbent upon all of us, whatever belief, to call attention to the outrageous persecution being practiced by the Soviet Union upon its Jewish citizens. We must not turn our backs upon the overwhelming evidence of the renewed calculated outrages being perpetrated upon Russia's 3½ million Jews. If we do not raise our voices, then they will not be heard. We must not grow weary of the struggle. We must prove that our integrity of conscience is more enduring than the willingness of the Soviets to oppress. And, we must not cease our endeavors until the last Jew who wants to leave shakes the last grain of Russian earth from his feet.

To those who seek to deprive the Jewish people of their right to be Jews, I can only offer the examples of history. The Pharaohs are gone. So are the oppressors of the Middle Ages. The Inquisition interests only scholars of the period. The persecutors of Dreyfus lie in unnamed graves. Hitler is dead, and he and his works remain a curse in the minds of men. The same is true of Stalin. Nasser is already a fading memory in the minds of those who were once familiar with his goals of Jewish annihilation. Yet the Jewish people are not only with us and thriving, but continue to make their unique contributions in every field of human endeavor.

Can anyone doubt the end result of the present conflict between Jewish faith and Communist persecution? I, for one, harbor no doubts as to the ultimate outcome. For when the present rulers of the Soviet Union are dust, and their names but a faint memory in the minds of mankind, the Jewish people will live; Am Yisroel Chai.

CURRENT COMMENT

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1975

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to find that the new Governor of California is recognizing the need for heroic measures to trim the budget on the State level. While we may be in less than perfect agreement on many issues, I applaud the trend which is cited in a recent column by my longtime friend Warren Butler. The column appeared in the March 27 Herald-American and Call Enterprise newspapers serving the cities of Norwalk, Downey, Paramount, and Bellflower, Calif. At this point in the RECORD I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House the commentary entitled "Brown and Money." The column follows:

CURRENT COMMENT

(By Warren Butler)

BROWN AND MONEY

Some of the people who hoped that the election of Governor Brown would lead to a wild orgy of spending at Sacramento are being sadly disappointed. While these same

people jumped all over his predecessor, Ronald Reagan, for being a penny pincher and a budget cutter despite continuing budget increases during his administration they are being strangely silent while his predecessor is demonstrating that when he said he was going to keep the state budget in balance he meant exactly what he said. And he is making some very remarkable statements which strangely are not being featured on newspaper front pages and are repeated only briefly in mild form on television.

But we think that some of these statements are worth much further repetition. They are much more articulate and candid than ever came from Reagan. Particularly in point were his comments about school financing.

HAS DOUBTS

"Do you really think that another \$100,000,000 would make it possible for children to read and write better?" Brown asked, "I have some doubts."

Brown said that the schools should not expect an economic windfall from the state. He declared it was a "fair guess" that the schools will not get what they think they need.

"In a time of economic hardship, in a time of uncertainty when men and women are being put out of work," declared the governor, "I think we all have to be ready to sacrifice, to be ready to re-examine our assumptions. I'm not prepared to endorse just any solution to some very serious difficulties we're having in educating the young people of the state."

He said he would like "to talk about performance at the same time we talk about money."

"There may be some misapprehension that I can create money by making a speech or by somehow acquiescing to a proposal. There's only so much money generated. If people are thrown out of work, if people are put on welfare then we have less money for other things."

NO MAGIC SOLUTION

He said he expected "teachers, state workers, reporters, politicians, and everybody else" to understand that.

"I think it's time that people faced that and didn't look for a magic solution, or obscure the fact that we are in a declining economic situation."

He said his responsibility as governor is to "take the total picture and not to accept the totality of any one special interest group's request."

"Expectations are inflated. People are not facing economic reality in this state or in this country. I certainly think it would ill serve anyone if I kidded people into thinking there are more cookies in the jar than I actually see."

The governor declared that he is dedicated to improving the quality of education in California but "mindless pouring of money down the multiplicity of pipelines does not add up to a solution."

EASY DECISION

Reiterating his campaign pledge not to raise taxes, Brown declared that "Once you've said that, a tremendous number of decisions make themselves."

Brown's remarks followed the failure of 63 tax override elections throughout the state and the failure in the Senate Finance Committee of a bill opposed by Brown to give \$75,000,000 additional to the state's schools each year.

To hear a politician talk this way about spending money after more than 40 years of watching politicians compete for public favor by promising greater spending is most refreshing. The governor will, of course, be under enormous pressure to let up in his attitude toward spending. Already he has been denounced in intemperate language by Bryan

Stevens, president of the California Teachers Association.

But we think if Brown is consistent in following his philosophy that the way to solve a public problem is not necessarily just to throw a lot of money at it he will find that he has a tremendous amount of support from sober and thinking citizens. The big question is whether he can resist the tremendous pressure for spending from the special interest groups that want more spending.

Many people will differ with the governor about his stand on so-called tax loopholes as there are many differing opinions of what loopholes really are and what their merits really are. But few thoughtful people can disagree that public money ought to be spent frugally, especially in these times.

IMPORTANCE OF REDUCING FEDERAL SPENDING

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1975

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, in the April issue of the Reader's Digest, Secretary of the Treasury William Simon had a very thought-provoking article entitled "Big Government and Our Economic Woes." His major thesis is exactly what I have been advocating in the 8 years I have been a Member of Congress. More importantly, he points out the very state of affairs in which we will find ourselves if we do not soon gain control over Federal spending and strive for a balanced budget. I commend the following article to my colleagues:

BIG GOVERNMENT AND OUR ECONOMIC WOES

(By William E. Simon, Secretary of the Treasury)

For more than 40 years, we in the United States have turned increasingly to the federal government to solve our problems. Yet, as the government has enlarged its dominion over our affairs, it has become increasingly apparent that concentrating power in Washington can be inefficient, wasteful, and ultimately destructive of our freedoms. Indeed, the forces of Big Government—however well-intentioned—bear significant responsibility for creating the woes we have in the economy today.

Before we turn still further toward centralization, it is urgent that we take a hard look at ourselves:

Item: Just before the New Deal, government spending took 12 percent of our gross national product. Today it takes a third. If present trends continue, it will take 60 percent by the year 2000.

Item: It required 186 years for the federal budget to reach the \$100-billion figure, a line crossed in 1962. Only nine more were needed to reach the \$200-billion mark, and then only four more years to reach \$300 billion. The sums are almost beyond comprehension. If \$400,000 had been spent every day since Christ was born the total would still not come to \$300 billion.

Item: Excluding the war years, the federal budget ran a surplus about four out of every five years until the 1930s. When we close the books on this fiscal year, we will have had 14 deficits in the last 15 years.

Item: One out of every six working Americans is employed by federal, state or local governments. The government has become the nation's biggest boss, with more employ-

ees than the auto industry, the steel industry and all other durable-goods manufacturers combined.

It is clear to me that we have more government than we need, more government than most people want, and certainly more government than we are willing to pay for.

Big Government is not undesirable *per se* any more than bigness in any organization is undesirable *per se*. But Big Government has become Bad Government because of what it has done to our economy and to our personal freedoms.

INFLATION CAUSE

Much of today's inflation can be directly traced to excessive government spending. A widely accepted theory of economics is that when the economy is weak, deficit spending by the government helps to pump it up. Conversely, however, when the economy is strong, the government should discipline itself to achieve budgetary surpluses and stabilize prices.

Instead, in our incessant desire to buy more than we can afford, we have slipped into deficit spending almost every year, good and bad. And because the economy was booming during much of the past decade, federal budget deficits have become a major source of economic instability.

Moreover, heavy government borrowing to cover these deficits has helped drive up interest rates and deny industry the private capital it has traditionally borrowed to expand and to employ new workers. During the coming fiscal year, government borrowing will total 80 percent of the capital market, leaving only 20 for private industry.

Another inflationary element in this witches' brew has been our monetary policy. Between 1955 and 1965, the money supply grew at a rate of about 2½ percent a year, and we enjoyed a period of reasonable price stability. Since 1965, however, the annual rate of increase in the money supply has more than doubled, to nearly six percent. This has been far beyond the level needed for stable economic growth, and the only way that extra money could be absorbed was through higher prices.

Fueled by the government's excessive fiscal and monetary policies as well as exploding food and oil prices, inflation hit record peacetime levels in 1975 and, as it did, it had a secondary effect: it tipped the economy downward toward recession. Rising prices caused the biggest drop in consumer spending since World War II. Similarly, as inflation drove up interest rates, housing—one of the nation's largest industries—fell into a horrible slump. In short, inflation has been a major cause of the recession and remains our most fundamental, long-term problem.

IMPACT ON PRODUCTION

Closely related to government-created inflationary pressures are the impediments that restrictive government policies place on production. Federal regulation of natural gas is a classic example. For more than two decades, despite repeated warnings by experts, the Federal Power Commission has kept the wellhead price of natural gas at an abnormally low level, in order to hold down prices for consumers. But this has reduced the incentive to develop new domestic supplies, and today there is much less natural gas available than we need. Government regulation has, in effect, created a national shortage.

We might also benefit strikingly if greater competition were introduced in the Postal Service. For almost two centuries government has enjoyed a monopoly over first-class mail, but with irritating frequency we have had to endure second-class service. By contrast, we have permitted private competition in parcel-post delivery, and in the past decade, because of better service, private delivery services have attracted away almost

half of all packages delivered. If we were willing to cut the government umbilical cord, we might have much the same result in first-class mail.

Another particularly vexing problem arises from the federal regulatory agencies, which now exercise control over air, rail and truck transportation, power generation, television, radio and the securities market—industries that account for ten percent of everything made and sold. While initially set up for sound reasons, the regulatory process has become enormously complex, cumbersome, inefficient and overly protective of the industries it regulates—all at the expense of the consumer. The Interstate Commerce Commission, for instance, now has on its books some 40 trillion rates, and 400,000 new tariff schedules are proposed each year to tell the transportation industry what it can charge.

Economic wastage from government regulatory processes ranges into the tens of billions of dollars. For example, the government allows some trucks to carry cargo in only one direction, and others to carry only a small range of commodities on the return trip. Regulated truckers travel some 30 percent of their routes with empty "backhauls," costing consumers \$5 to \$10 billion. Another example: It is 200 miles farther from San Francisco to Los Angeles than from New York to Washington, yet the air fare from San Francisco to Los Angeles is almost a third lower. Why? Airlines operating within California are intrastate and thus compete in an unregulated free market; prices on the East Coast flights are regulated by the government. Or look at the railroads. In deep financial trouble, they are required by the government to maintain upward of 50,000 route miles no longer needed—excess trackage that drives up costs. There are but three of hundreds of government impositions on our system that raise the cost of living for all of us.

SMALL PROFITS, SMALL GROWTH

To pay for the rising costs of public programs, we have transferred mounting sums of our wealth from the most productive part of our economy, the private sector, to the least productive, the government. To put people back to work, we must not only provide public-service jobs, but, more important, we must return to economic fundamentals.

When adjusted for the effects of inflation on inventory and depreciation, after-tax corporate profits have actually declined by 50 percent since 1965. It is not unfair to say that the country has entered a "profits depression." Moreover, for more than a decade, capital investments have been at the lowest level of any major industrialized country in the Free World, and the growth in productivity of American workers has been just over half as large as in France and Germany, and less than one third as large as in Japan.

It is imperative that we make better provisions for the future. We must begin to shift the long-run balance of domestic priorities away from consumption and government spending and toward investment and increased productivity. History will ultimately judge us not just on our immediate success in coping with recession—and we will succeed in that endeavor—but on our ability to deal with the more fundamental problems of resource allocation and capital formation. If we fail to address these challenges, we will fail to attain the rising standard of living that should be our goal.

Some people argue that the answer to the current economic crisis lies in more governmental control. Looking at what Big Government has done to our economy, I believe it is time to say "No." Two approaches in particular are objectionable:

¹ See "Highway Robbery—Via the ICC," The Reader's Digest, January '75.

One: Greater federal spending. The drumbeat for still bigger spending programs can be heard regularly along the corridors of the Capitol. Because of the continuing threat of inflation, however, this recession must be treated quite differently from those of the past. Unbridled spending could set off a new cycle of inflation and recession that would be far more severe. Thus, the President proposed a tax cut to strengthen the forces of recovery, but to ward off further inflation he is also seeking to curb the momentous growth of federal spending.

Two: Wage and price controls. Public-opinion polls show that a majority of Americans now favor controls. That's discouraging. Controls have been tried over and over again, and not once have they worked. They may yield short-term gains, but within a matter of months they begin to create significant distortions and inequities within the economy. Our 1971-74 experience with them should have taught us that, instead of eliminating inflation, wage-price controls only conceal it—eventually it returns in much more virulent form. Advocates of a planned economy argue that prices remained fairly stable under controls in World War II, but they fail to point out that when controls were phased out after the war, wholesale prices shot up nearly 30 percent in one year.

If we are seduced once again by the siren song of controls, within two years we will face a cruel dilemma: whether to lift the controls and uncork horrendous problems of inflation and unemployment, or stick with controls for good and gradually stifle the free-enterprise system. That is a choice we can avoid if we avoid the controls themselves.

THE BETTER WAY

There are other ways to attack our long-range problems—ways that will work without concentrating still greater power and influence in Washington. For once, let us attack the causes of our problems and not the results.

With revenues falling off sharply and expenditures rising inexorably, large federal deficits are inescapable in the immediate future. Thereafter, however, the economy regains its health, we must restore much greater fiscal and monetary discipline so that we do not have deficits during years of boom.

We must overhaul the government's regulatory system. This will be extremely difficult because the special interests benefiting from regulation are much more powerful and united than their opponents. But we can no longer afford the waste and inefficiencies that excessive regulation creates.

We continue to need tax reforms. For both individuals and businesses, inflation increases the effective tax rate even though they are no better off. In addition, most of our major trading partners have largely eliminated the traditional two-tier tax system in which income is taxed once at the corporate level and again on the dividends received by stockholders. For our own economic health, we should ask whether it is good for us that the burden of business taxation here is heavier than in almost any other major industrialized nation.

OUR BASIC DECISION

Overall, the most critical economic decision we face is whether we want to leave our basic freedoms in the hands of private citizens. The nation has now reached a crossroads. In a very basic sense, we must choose either to restore a more competitive, more open society or to commit ourselves—perhaps irrevocably—to a society in which the large decisions about our economic and personal welfare are made by a central government.

History surely teaches us that the system of free enterprise, despite its many flaws, is the system most compatible with the protection of rights and liberties as well as the one that is most productive of material goods. Equally so, recent history shows that govern-

ment, despite its splendid intentions, is incapable of matching the vitality, the wisdom and the ingenuity of free men.

AMERICAN MILITARY DISENGAGEMENT IN INDOCHINA

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1975

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, two thoughtful articles have appeared in the New York Times last week concerning American military disengagement in Indochina, which I hope will be read and understood by all those who are trying to bludgeon the American collective conscience with charges that we are guilty of abandoning innocent people and that the suffering and bloodshed in South Vietnam is somehow our fault.

I reject these charges summarily. They insult the intelligence and denigrate the compassion of the American people. This Nation has expended billions of dollars in this futile conflict. Over 50,000 young American lives have already been lost in this sacrificial rite. Why was this sacrifice made, and what has it achieved? To whose distorted vision of "U.S. responsibility" have we committed dollars, lives and our national pride?

I do not believe the public sentiment that overwhelmingly favors a military disengagement in Indochina represents a retreat from responsibility. On the contrary, I believe it represents the culmination of a protracted and often painful maturation process—a growth in the understanding of the American people that the United States cannot impose its political values on another culture through the establishment and support of inherently corrupt regimes that purport to oppose communism. Our responsibility as a world leader does not mean refashioning the entire world in our own image. This is a perception that wrongfully implies that our values and philosophies are superior to those of everyone else.

The American people have slowly but surely come to the understanding that massive military aid cannot solve the problems of a foreign government that has failed to inspire the confidence and support of its own people.

Our national coffers are not limitless; indeed, we find ourselves pinching pennies and stretching dollars to meet compelling needs here at home. U.S. foreign aid, be it economic, technical, nutritional or military should be expended very judiciously, and such expenditures should be reviewed regularly to determine their effectiveness. The American people are entitled to the assurance that this money is being wisely spent. The people we are trying to help with this aid are entitled to the same assurance.

Our foreign aid program, viewed within the parameters of goal achievement, has been a resounding failure. We have failed repeatedly to assess the social and political implications of the interface of American technology, hardware, and values on a foreign culture.

This assessment must be an integral part of our foreign policy formation process. We must examine needs very carefully to determine how we can get the best results most economically.

The recent policy shift in the World Bank is a case in point. That institution will now be making far more money available to small farmers in the underdeveloped world, instead of pouring massive amounts of money into the establishment of large agribusiness operations that work well in this country but which have been less than spectacular successes abroad.

This is precisely the policy shift that is needed in many other areas of U.S. involvement, including Indochina. We could have done far more to influence the growth of democracy in South Vietnam by meeting the economic needs of the small farmers in that country than by infusing massive military aid to support a regime that enriched itself at the expense of its own people and the American public. Opportunities for this kind of assistance still abound, even in Indochina, and I believe the American people will be supportive of this policy shift.

The American people are generous to a fault. They have consistently opened their hearts and their pocketbooks to those in need, both at home and abroad. The American people have come to the realization that the Vietnam war has been a bad investment.

There is a dignified and far more effective way to achieve social and economic goals for developing countries. Let us dedicate ourselves to humanitarian and sound economic aid programs that hold out the promise of peace and prosperity, instead of devotion to a futile quest for domination. The American people have realized the value of the former, and reject the hypocrisy of the latter.

As James Thomson's thoughtful article points out, this Nation simply needs to say that—

We did our best, but that events went otherwise, that the Vietnamese chose otherwise. And that we will now allocate all we can to the relieving of immediate suffering, to the providing of safe haven for those whose lives are endangered through close allegiance to us, and to the rehabilitation of shattered lands and peoples—in the North and South and also in Cambodia. This is the way that we can show the world "the magnanimity of a strong and compassionate people."

Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues will benefit from the thoughtful views in these two well-written articles, and I include them at this point in my remarks:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 9, 1975]

LEARNING FROM THE PAST

American disengagement in Indochina and the military debacle in South Vietnam and Cambodia have aroused fears that the United States may be entering a new era of isolationism or at least impotence in the world arena. President Ford has even hinted darkly that those who sought the end of this country's military involvement with Saigon were advocating a retreat behind Fortress America.

The Army Chief of Staff says that only another half-billion dollars, if sent quickly enough, will enable Saigon to fight off enemy attack. General Weyand's request, reported yesterday, recalls the last-ditch con-

viction of Gen. William C. Westmoreland in 1968, that another 206,000 American troops would do the job in South Vietnam that twice that number had been unable to accomplish. Such requests for help are second-nature from worried strategists whose defenses are crumbling; they bear no relation to the national interests of the United States, or to its role in the world.

History cannot be undone; but errors committed in the past need not jeopardize a nation's future—provided its political leaders have the wisdom to recognize and the strength to admit those errors. No purpose is served by pinning familiar old labels on new and greatly different situations.

It is not the mark of isolationism for the United States to re-examine the validity of its role as automatic protector of any regime that calls itself the enemy of Communism. If the United States is to be unselective in its reliability, as Secretary of State Kissinger would have it, then this country must exercise extreme selectivity in its military commitments.

Great powers have often tended to confuse their international obligations with an innate desire to fashion other nations in their own image. Thus the United States has deluded itself into believing that the symbols of American democracy could automatically turn allied forces into freedom fighters. Such illusions tend to corrupt clients, as well as patrons. The risk is compounded when the American flag is allowed to be identified with the power of privilege and the defense of the status quo. It is in this way that the United States has so often unwittingly forfeited its own advocacy of social reform to Communist propagandists.

To recognize such failures and to come to a realistic understanding of the limitations of American power is not to condemn ourselves to passivity or isolationism. There is much this country can do in honoring commitments legitimately entered into to protect its vital interests and in making common cause with those who truly speak for their people's aspirations. The success of the Marshall Plan offers ample illustration of America's potential to use its resources and its diplomacy as an effective bulwark against want and war.

Except for the remaining humanitarian task of alleviating the suffering left in the war's aftermath, the book will soon have to be closed on the tragic misreading of the United States' role in Indochina. This has nothing to do with isolationism nor the abrogation of a commitment. It is simply the honorable recognition, at long last, of the failure of a policy on which much blood and treasure have been tragically expended.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 10, 1975]

AS ASIA GOES, SO GOES NEW YORK

(By James Thomson)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—At last it begins to end, suddenly very quickly. A re-run of Nationalist China's collapse, but delayed by 25 years of great-power interventions.

The horror of present Indochina suffering should be intensified for Americans by a sense of history; how it happened, and how it could have been avoided.

One beginning came thirty years ago this autumn when the United States permitted France to reoccupy her Indochina colonies after Japan's surrender.

A bigger beginning was the Truman-Acheson decision in early 1950 to recognize the French puppet Bao Dai as ruler of Vietnam, to spurn Ho Chi Minh's independent revolutionary government, and to commit American arms and dollars to the pro-French side in the Vietnamese civil war.

"With [this act] the United States embarked upon another ill-conceived adventure doomed to end in another self-inflicted defeat," so wrote veteran journalist Harold

Isaacs back in the April 11, 1950 issue of *The Reporter* magazine. "The real problem," he added, "is not how to implement this policy but how to extricate ourselves from it."

This week, precisely a quarter-century later, Mr. Isaacs' prophecy is fulfilled as that ill-conceived adventure finally careens to a halt. Not tidily, arranged under chandeliers by men in morning coats around the green table. Not even gradually, allowing for the protection of the innocents. But suddenly, with breakneck speed and with suffering beyond belief.

The swiftness of the collapse is a surprise. But not the human tragedy. For how else do civil wars end? They are always an all-or-nothing contest; anything less than an ending is merely a suspension.

Three times now, in 1946, 1954 and 1973, Vietnam's revolutionary leaders—that potent early fusion of Communists and nationalists who threw out the French—were persuaded to accept a suspension. But only a suspension each time, an imposed intermission in an unfinished civil war.

For the overriding question, from 1945 onward, has been: Who shall rule a united Vietnam? And the mission of Vietnam's would-be liberators—Ho Chi Minh, General Giap, the party and the army—has been successively, for thirty years, to oust the French, to oust the Americans, and to displace those Vietnamese élites that collaborated with the foreigners.

True, of course, that those élites—officers, bureaucrats, politicians, businessmen, landowner, professionals, intellectuals, clergymen—included some who appealed to our best instincts, whose Westernized liberal values had little in common with the rampant venality, corruption, and barbarism of Saigon's changing cast of warlords.

True, too, that our Vietnam intervention had been in early times an explicable product of American ignorance and panic. Ill-informed about the indigenous nationalist roots of Vietnamese Communism, fearful of Moscow-run "monolithic Communism" after Mao's China triumph and blackmailed by the French (the price Paris demanded for joining any European defense arrangement) we took the wrong road in early 1950. And kept to it—even after the French went home—because of our enduring fear of Communism.

True, as well, that once anti-Communism receded as an overriding rationale, South Vietnam still seemed to some Americans a beguilingly special place: a congeries of ethnic, cultural, religious, and geographic complexities worth preserving under our tutelage, separate from the North. Hence the South's strong attraction not only to our military "counterinsurgency" specialists, C.I.A. operatives and A.I.D. advisers, but also to a wide variety of our academic social scientists, church groups and journalists. Couldn't South Vietnam somehow prove a point or two, at least be a useful laboratory for "Free World" development? So was born the resilient canard that it was not, after all, a civil war.

Finally, of course, there was that wondrous Eisenhower invention of 1954, the "domino theory"—the proposition that all Asian states act alike (perhaps because they all look alike, to those who don't look closely); and that if one were to fall over, so too would all the others. Vietnam today, Thailand tomorrow, then Japan, and not far ahead, the beaches of Waikiki.

Even sophisticates, not alarmed about Hawaii, did worry about Laos and Cambodia. And well they should have, for reasons having nothing to do with Communism, but rather with one of the peninsula's traditionally potent forces, "Annamite imperialism."

At best the domino theory described a mere commonplace: a "ripple effect," meaning that what happens in Holland does in fact hit

Belgium and Luxembourg quite heavily, France and Germany less so, Spain and Rumania hardly at all.

And for some time now that ripple effect has been belatedly at work. Laos, a traditional buffer between Vietnamese and Thais, has arranged a coalition of Communists and others that reflects the political realities of that backward kingdom. Thailand, after two decades of un-Thai behavior—putting all its security eggs in one American basket—is returning to the politics of multiple baskets (call it neutralism or a balancing act) that have guaranteed Thai independence from foreign conquest for centuries.

But Cambodia, most cruelly, is a victim of whiplash: preserved as an island of relative peace under the quick-footed Prince Norodom Sihanouk, it was betrayed by the Lon Nol coup of 1970 and then destroyed by the American "incursion," an invasion that created the successful Cambodian insurrection.

Of all the high crimes for which Richard Nixon must be held to account by history, none can be higher than the senseless destruction of Khmer civilization. What's left of Cambodia, after American aerial destruction, will be ruled by what's left of Cambodia's Communist.

There was, of course, a further reason for the continued durability of the domino theory. And that is—as Daniel Ellsberg and others have noted—the compelling feeling among Democrats and Republicans alike that the most important domino of all (perhaps the only one all along) was the Administration in power in Washington: the conviction that if an Administration were to "lose" any Asian country to "Communism," that Administration would proceed to lose the next national election. The alleged lesson had been learned when the Democrats were turned out of office in 1952 after President Truman and Secretary of State Dean Acheson had "lost China."

The question now is still that same old Isaacs question of 25 years ago: Having chosen the path to a self-inflicted defeat, how do we "extricate ourselves" from the policy that brought it about?

There are two ways. One is to replay the "loss of China" script. That would involve (quite soon) an open season in the search for scapegoats. President Ford and Henry Kissinger have already tilted in that direction: had not the Congress reduced Vietnam aid and "frustrated" Presidential freedom to "deter," etc., there would still be hope.

And who runs the Congress? The same party that "lost China"—the Democrats. (Actually, it was the Chinese Nationalist Party that lost China; but that is a different and too long story.) A dicey Presidential election is coming up. Can many Republicans and even some Democrats resist the temptation to return us now to the McCarthy-McCarran era?

But there is another way—short of the admission of error, the mea culpa of which governments seem all together incapable. A way to face not Vietnam's "loss," but the misery-ridden end to our tragic intervention in the Vietnamese civil war. That would be simply to say we did our best, but that events went otherwise, that the Vietnamese chose otherwise. And that we will now allocate all we can to the relieving of immediate suffering, to the providing of safe haven for those whose lives are endangered through close allegiance to us, and to the rehabilitation of shattered lands and peoples—in the North and the South, and also in Cambodia. Even Lyndon Johnson offered as much in his famous Johns Hopkins speech on April 7, 1965, while our bombs were widening the bloodbath.

Who knows how we will choose, at a time of shaken economy at home and possible war in the Middle East. One way lies further

folly, the wrath of spoiled children whose will has been thwarted.

The other way lies maturity: the willingness to learn from error, to accept our chastening, to cast off our grandiosity, to forgive and ask forgiveness, and to show the magnanimity of a strong and compassionate people.

PRO AMERICA RESOLUTIONS— PART III

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1975

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, as you will recall, last week on Wednesday, April 9, and Thursday, April 10, I placed in the RECORD copies of the first 11 resolutions adopted by the National Association of Pro America in April 1974.

I am today bringing to the attention of the Members of this House the remaining resolutions 13 through 20. The Pro America Women are to be commended for their dedication to the principles of our Constitution, and their efforts to preserve our Republic are recognized and appreciated by all of us in Congress who share their same concerns.

The full text of resolutions 13 through 20 follows:

OPPOSITION TO ABORTION ON DEMAND

Whereas in recent Supreme Court decisions on abortion the Supreme Court violated the separation of powers doctrine by deliberately drafting model legislation, and usurped powers reserved to the states by the Tenth Amendment; and

Whereas the court majority used the 14th Amendment as the basis for their decision that a woman's right to "privacy and freedom" justified abortion within the first three months of pregnancy, with conditional rights for the next three months; and

Whereas the court did not merely legalize abortion but prohibited laws intended to prevent abortion except in the last three months of pregnancy; and

Whereas the 14th Amendment contained no provision even remotely related to abortion and at the time it was "more or less" ratified 36 of the 37 states in the union contained statutes limiting or prohibiting abortion; and

Whereas the court admitted that the crux of the decision is whether an unborn child is a person within the meaning of the law whose right to life is protected by the 5th and 14th Amendments; and

Whereas two of Webster's standard dictionaries define "child" as "human being unborn or recently born, fetus, infant, baby, person unborn or recently born" (emphasis added); and

Whereas although the court was unable to "resolve the difficult question" as to when life begins, it has been ably answered by Dr. Henry E. Garrett, former head of the psychology department at Columbia University who wrote in his book "Psychology and Life" "When the egg of the female parent has been fertilized by the sperm of the male parent the life of the new individual begins"; and

Whereas if the fetus has life (as is admitted by the medical term "Fetal death") and if it is human as it must be if the mother is human, it has an unalienable right to life, and to cause the death of a human fetus is homicide; and

Whereas it is axiomatic that one person's freedom ends where it infringes on another's,

so does a woman's "freedom and privacy" (however unlimited it may have been before conception) and where their exercise deprives another human being of life; and

Whereas Judeo-Christianity has always taught that man is precious because he is made in the image of God and that the killing of a man is only excusable if done accidentally, in defense of the life of oneself or another, or as atonement for crime; and

Whereas if the killing of the most innocent and helpless of human beings—the unborn—because of the "convenience" of the mother, is legalized, the gradual acceptance of the elimination of other segments of the population because of age, infirmity, unproductiveness or even political heresy could follow; now, therefore,

Be it resolved That the National Association of Pro America oppose abortion except under extreme circumstances; and

Be it further resolved That the National Association of Pro America urge Congress to remove the appellate jurisdiction of the federal courts in all cases involving abortion.

Documentation:

"Handbook on Abortion" by Dr. and Mrs. J. C. Willke

"About Killing the Unborn" by Dr. Medford Evans, Feb. 14, 1973 *Review of the News Article* by James J. Kilpatrick, *Houston Chronicle*, Jan. 27, 1974

Article by Dr. Robert Morris, *Houston Tribune*, Feb. 23, 1973

OPPOSITION TO THE FEDERAL RESERVE TOTAL BANK CONTROL

Whereas "Congress shall have power . . . To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof . . ." (Article I, Section 8, United States Constitution), therefore the Federal Reserve Act of 1913 in usurping this authority is clearly unconstitutional; and

Whereas if the concepts expressed by Meyer Amschel Rothschild who reputedly declared "Give me control over a nation's economy, and I care not who makes its laws" are valid, it seems apparent that constitutional protections and individual freedom of United States citizens are gravely endangered, to the benefit of the international banking world monopoly; and

Whereas contrary to public opinion, the Federal Reserve Banking system is, for all practical purposes, not an agency of the government, but a privately owned organization for profit; and

Whereas the Federal Reserve Board has proposed legislation that would extend its power to set reserves for some 5,000 non-member banks as well as some Savings and Loan Associations; and

Whereas under federal law, nationally chartered banks must be members of the Federal Reserve System, while State chartered banks have the option of coming under the Federal Reserve Board's jurisdiction or subjecting themselves to state regulation only; and

Whereas state bank reserves often can be held in the form of interest-bearing securities or deposits in other banks, but the Federal Reserve Board pays no interest; and

Whereas since 1960, seven hundred and fifty banks have left the Federal Reserve system while seventeen hundred others receiving new State charters have chosen not to join; and

Whereas the reserve requirements are the lever by which the Federal Reserve controls the growth of the money supply and thus the growth, control and management of this country's economy; and

Whereas the Federal Reserve System which unlawfully regulate currency and credit and, to a startling degree can cause inflation or depression, has never been audited in the sixty-one year period since its founding; now, therefore,

Be it resolved That the National Association of Pro America urge Congress to require an immediate public audit and investigation of the Federal Reserve System aimed at restoring congressional authority over the United States monetary system; and

Be it further resolved That the National Association of Pro America strongly oppose any legislation which would (1) foster Federal Reserve Board's authority to further manage the economy through total control of the money supplies, (2) restrict the State Banks' freedom to choose between State or Federal regulation and (3) destroy the dual banking system.

Documentation:

Patman Calls Fed Plan to Expand Control of Banks a "Power Grab"—L.A. Times (AP) Jan. 29, 1974.

Wall Street Journal, Jan. 28, 1974—"Fed to Extend Its Power."

Los Angeles Times—Part II, Jan. 28, 1974—"Fed Seeks Regulation State Banks, S & Ls."

Wall Street Journal—Nov. 2, 1973 "Speaking of Business" by Lindley H. Clark, Jr.

REPEAL PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS REVIEW ORGANIZATION

Whereas in 1972 Congress created the Professional Standards Review Organization (PSRO) as an amendment to the Social Security Act; and

Whereas PSRO introduces and requires a new and foreign philosophy of medical care in the United States, namely, that henceforth the "care, diagnosis and treatment" for private citizens by private doctors shall comply with government-dictated concepts of medical care as approved by a Professional Standards Review Organization and the Secretary of the Department of Health Education and Welfare for beneficiaries of Social Security programs; and

Whereas this government intervention immediately intrudes upon the confidentiality of the doctor-patient relationship and brings the doctor's judgment and the patient's assured; and

Whereas PSRO guidelines not only create a vast new bureaucracy, but impose the obligation on doctors to meet government approved "norms" of "health care" implemented through the use of computers which will result in standardization and mediocrity in medical practice at incalculable cost to the taxpayers; and

Whereas PSRO is the result of ill conceived legislation, passed at the eleventh hour in Congress over opposition from practically all sectors of the organized medical profession and of the hospital associations, and can only result in the rationing of medical care for Social Security beneficiaries; now, therefore,

Be it resolved That the National Association of Pro America vigorously oppose any government intervention in the practice of medicine or intrusion into the confidentiality of the doctor-patient relationship, and call for immediate repeal of the Professional Standards Review Organization Amendment to the Social Security Act.

Documentation:

"P.S.R.O." by American Association Council of Medical Staffs of Private Hospitals, Inc.—New Orleans—3rd Edition Revised May 1973.

RETAIN CONSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR THE PRESIDENCY

Whereas Article II, Section I of the Constitution of the United States says "No person except a natural born citizen, or a citizen of the United States at the time of the adoption of this Constitution shall be eligible to the Office of President; neither shall any person be eligible to that who shall not have attained to the age of thirty five years and been fourteen years a resident within the United States"; now, therefore,

Be it resolved That the National Association of Pro America urge the Congress of the United States to adhere faithfully to those stipulations, and resist all efforts to amend that portion of the Constitution.

STATE LEGISLATORS CALLED UPON TO OPPOSE FEDERAL BUREAUCRACY

Whereas by the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States all powers not specifically delegated to the federal government, nor prohibited by it to the states are reserved to the people of the states; and

Whereas the legislators of the several states are required to take an oath of office to support and defend the United States Constitution and the Constitutions of their States; and

Whereas state legislators of the several states are relinquishing their authority to federally appointed bureaus, such as the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA), the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), Federal Food and Drug Administration (FDA), Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), Professional Standards Review Organization (PSRO) and the Land Use and Planning Assistant Act—to mention a few—in exchange for federal grants which in turn bring federal control in violation of Amendment X of the United States Constitution; now, therefore,

Be it resolved That the National Association of Pro America request the legislators of the several States to assume their stated responsibility and demand that the federal government return to constitutional principles and leave the administration of state governments to the duly elected State representatives; and

Be it further resolved That the National Association of Pro America urge the State Chapters to send copies of this resolution to their State Legislators.

Documentation:

"Inside Washington" by Robert S. Allen, Jan. 20, 1974—A Nauseous Revival of Scandal-Ridden Bureaus—Santa Ana Register

A.M.A. Will Seek Repeal of O.S.H.A. by Harry Nelson—L. A. Times, Dec. 6, 1973

"Was Barry Goldwater gated"—Santa Ana Register—Jan. 27, 1974

"Rule by Non-Laws" by Jo Hindman, Nov. 3, 1973—Metro News

SUPPORT LOYALTY OATH

Whereas the Supreme Court has ruled that States may not bar political parties from the ballot for refusing to renounce the violent overthrow of the United States government; and

Whereas the Communist Party, whose members have no loyalty to the United States, is not a legitimate political party in the sense that term is used in this country but is in fact a criminal conspiracy by a foreign power; and

Whereas Article II of the United States Constitution provides that Congress has the right to limit or remove appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court; now, therefore,

Be it resolved That the National Association of Pro America request its Congressmen to exercise their constitutional authority and take appropriate action to correct the effects of this dangerous decision.

Documentation:

"Loyalty Oath Banned for Political Parties", Los Angeles Times, Jan. 10, 1974, U.S. Constitution—Article III

URGE RESTORATION OF NATIONAL ORIGINS QUOTA SYSTEM IMMIGRATION

Whereas it is estimated that there are up to five million illegal aliens in the United States and that there will be seventeen million in ten years, who accept welfare checks, affect the nation's unemployment situation, and yet pay no taxes; and

Whereas in 1965 Congress made a radical change in United States immigration policy, abolishing the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act containing the National Origins Quota System of numerical and ethnic restrictions on aliens, resulting thereby in a flood of immigrants from such utterly different cultural, religious, governmental and legal backgrounds that it threatens the destruction of this country's traditional culture, freedoms and form of government; and

Whereas the myth of "over population" is being used to coerce middle class Americans into limiting families yet it has been stated that four out of every five new Americans are aliens, who also drastically affect the unemployment situation, many accept welfare checks, and some pay no taxes; and

Whereas most countries of the world base their immigration policy on their own best interests, while the United States pursues a policy based on sentimentality and pity to the point of its own destruction; now, therefore,

Be it resolved That the National Association of Pro America proclaim that there is a population explosion of immigrants, not native born Americans, urge Congress to restore the National Origins Quota System, and reaffirm all previous resolutions on immigration.

Documentation:

"While America Sleeps, Foundations Crumble" by Mary Barclay Erb

"Our Mounting Wave of Illegal Immigrants" by Nathan M. Adams, reprinted in Reader's Digest, December 1973

REAFFIRMATIONS 1974

The National Association of Pro America reaffirms the following:

Genocide Convention

All past resolutions opposing the Genocide Convention and urges continued opposition to it.

Inflationary policies of Federal Government

Resolution No. 11, 1973, Disapproval of the onus inflationary practices and policies of the federal government.

American Civil Liberties Union

Resolution No. 11, 1973, Disapproval of the American Civil Liberties Union, and urges congressional investigation.

National defense

Resolution No. XII, 1972, National Defense, alerting Congress and the President to inherent dangers unless military strength in every area is upgraded.

National voter registration

Resolution No. XIV, 1972, Oppose National Voter Registration, and urge continued opposition.

Equal rights amendment

Resolution No. X, 1973, Dangers of the Equal Rights Amendment, and urges continued opposition to this amendment and continued efforts to rescind it where ratified.

OSHA

Resolution No. V, 1973, calling for repeal of OSHA.

Federal Food and Drug Administration

Resolution No. XIII, 1973, calling for rescission of FDA controls regulating sale of vitamins, minerals and health foods, and urges support for legislation protecting the right of the consumer to buy the potency and combination of vitamins and minerals desired.

PPES

Resolution No. XVI, 1972, Oppose Planning, Programming, Budgeting System for Public Schools Across the Nation, expressing opposition to the financing of any goal-setting process.

April 14, 1975

GROWING SUPPORT FOR EXTENSION AND EXPANSION OF VOTING RIGHTS ACT TO COVER SPANISH-SPEAKING AMERICANS

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1975

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, there has been growing support for extension and expansion of the Voting Rights Act to provide protection for the Spanish-speaking citizens of our country. I would like to make the following cover letter, resolution, and telegrams part of the public record. The resolution has been unanimously adopted by the National Board of Trustees of the National Congress of Hispanic American Citizens, its membership, and the 95 participating national, State, and local Spanish-speaking organizations. The telegrams were sent to the national organization's office in Washington, D.C. and copies were forwarded to all the members of the Judiciary's Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights.

The articles follow:

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF HISPANIC AMERICAN CITIZENS.

HON. HERMAN BADILLO,
Member, House Committee on Civil and Constitutional Rights, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington D.C.

DEAR MR. BADILLO: I would like to submit to you and the other Members of the House Judiciary Subcommittee a Resolution that was unanimously adopted by the National Board of Trustees of the National Congress of Hispanic American Citizens, its membership, and the 95 participating national, state and local Spanish speaking organizations.

This Resolution supports the extension and expansion of the Voting Rights Act as proposed in H.R. 5552, the bill introduced by yourself and Representatives Edward Roybal and Ms. Barbara Jordan.

Additionally, I have included in this communication the numerous telegrams that have been received in our office that demonstrate the overwhelming support this measure (H.R. 5552) has received in our community.

For this Congress to ignore the unanimous consent of our community would be a gross denial of justice. I sincerely hope that the Subcommittee will assert itself to the end of creating some real fundamental and institutional change for the benefit of our nation's Spanish speaking.

Sinceramente,

MANUEL D. FIERRO,
President.

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE EXTENSION AND EXPANSION OF THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT (H.R. 5552)

Whereas, after thirteen days of hearings which were held by the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights, the need for expanded coverage to include Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, and other Spanish origin Americans under the Voting Rights Act was clearly established.

Whereas, documentation presented before the House Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights shows irrefutable evidence of a systematic effort to deny Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, and other Spanish origin Americans the right to vote.

Whereas, legislation, to overcome this pervasive pattern of voting discrimination and abuse against Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, and other Spanish origin Americans, has been jointly introduced by Congressmen Herman Badillo, Edward Roybal and Ms. Barbara Jordan (H.R. 5552) in the House of Representatives.

Let it then be resolved, that the National Congress of Hispanic American Citizens (El Congreso), a national nonpartisan citizen's lobby for and of the Spanish speaking, hereby endorses and fully supports the extension and expansion of the Voting Rights Act to include coverage to Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, and other Spanish origin Americans as proposed in H.R. 5552, a bill introduced by Congressmen Herman Badillo, Edward Roybal and Ms. Barbara Jordan.

Let it be further resolved, that the 95 participating national, state, and local Spanish speaking organizations, have equally endorsed and are fully supportive of H.R. 5552.

TELEGRAMS

SAGINAW, MICH.

Tri-city SER Board of Directors and the G.I. Forum of Saginaw support expanded coverage of the Voting Rights Act to include the Spanish speaking of the Midwest and other Spanish speaking people throughout the Nation as introduced by Congresspersons Badillo, Roybal and Jordan.

JOAQUIN DIAZ,

NATIONAL AND STATE PRESIDENT OF THE MEXICAN AMERICAN POLITICAL ASSOCIATION.

We want to express our full support for the passage of the Badillo, Roybal and Jordan (H.R. 5552) Voting Rights expansion bill. It is imperative that the Spanish speaking persons residing in predominately Spanish speaking populated states such as California, Texas and the entire Southwest be afforded this long overdue right to vote. Our organization urges that this vital piece of legislation be enacted upon immediately to benefit all the Spanish speaking persons in this country.

MARGARET CRUZ.

HOUSTON, TEX.

This is to assure you of my full support for H.R. 5552 by U.S. Representatives Badillo, Roybal and Jordan. The Voting Rights Act needs to be expanded in the Southwest and throughout the country.

BEN T. REYES,
State Representative.

POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE,

AUSTIN, TEX.

This is to inform my full support of H.R. 5552 as introduced by Congressmen Badillo, Roybal and Jordan, a measure that will expand the coverage of the VRA in the Southwest and throughout the entire country.

MARC CAMPOS DEJANO.

MERCED, CALIF.

The National Mexican American Chamber of Commerce 36 cities 7500 members all independent small businessmen express full support for the expanded coverage of Voting Rights Act to include the Spanish speaking in the entire country additionally we reaffirm our full support for bill H.R. 5552 introduced by Badillo, Roybal and Jordan.

JOSEPH FLORES,
Exec. Director.

I support H.R. 5552 by Badillo, Roybal and Jordan, which expands coverage of the 1965 Voting Rights Act in the Southwest and throughout the country.

CRAIG A. WASHINGTON,
Texas State Representative.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

As president of the Association of Mexican American Educators, Inc., California, I want to express our full support for the expanded coverage of the Voting Rights Act to include the Spanish Speaking in the Southwest and to other Spanish speaking groups throughout the country. Additionally, I want to reaffirm our full support of the Bill H.R. 5552 introduced by Badillo, Roybal and Jordan.

HELEN DIAZ.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

As Executive Director of the American Association of Spanish speaking CPA's I want to express our full support for expanding coverage of the Voting Rights Act to include the Spanish speaking in the Southwest and other Spanish speaking groups throughout the country. Additionally, I want to reaffirm our full support of bill H.R. 5552 introduced by Congressmen Badillo, Roybal and Congresswoman Jordan.

DANIEL ARCHULETA.

FORT WORTH, TEX.

In behalf of the national membership of the American G I Forum I wish to express full support of HR 5552 a bill that will expand coverage of the Voting Rights Act to the Spanish speaking populis of the United States in particular the Southwest block.

ANTONIO GIL MORALES,
National Chairman.

AMERICAN GI FORUM ROTC PROGRAM,

Austin, Tex.

On behalf of the national membership of the American G I Forum I wish to express full support of HR 5552 a bill that will expand coverage of Voter Rights Act to the entire Spanish speaking populis of the U.S. in particular the Southwestern block.

ALBERT SABATER,
Regional Coordinator.
YOLAND ACOSTA,
Administrative Assistant.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF LA RAZA.

Please accept this communication as a personal expression of full support for the expanded coverage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 amended to include the Spanish speaking in the Southwest and other Spanish speaking groups throughout the country. We also reaffirm our full support of HR 5552 introduced by Badillo, Jordan, and Roybal.

RAUL YZAGUIRRE,
National Director.
LULAC,
El Paso, Tex.

We strongly urge the expansion of the coverage of the Voting Rights Acts to include the Southwest and other Spanish origin groups as stated in HR 5552. We recommend highly not to enter any compromise that will weaken the effect to this important legislation.

E. J. MORENO,
President.

NATIONAL ISSUES CONFERENCE,

Lomita, Calif.

The National Issues Conference representing the 5 major Mexican American Organizations in California, MAPA, LULAX, GI Forum, IMAGE, and Comision Femenil. By resolution at the November 1974 Conference at Sacramento is on record supporting the concept of extending Voting Rights to the Spanish Speaking. We urge you convey our support to Ed Roybal and other sponsors, on the new Voting Rights bill.

MANUEL BANDA, JR.,
Executive Secretary.

NATIONAL IMAGE,
Phoenix, Ariz.

As national president of IMAGE I want to express our full support for the expanded coverage of the Voting Rights Act to include the Spanish speaking in the Southwest and other Spanish speaking groups throughout the country, additionally, I want to reaffirm our full support of the bill HR 5552 introduced by Badillo, Roybal, and Jordan.

EDWARD VALENZUELA,
President.

SER-JOBS FOR PROGRESS,
Joliet, Ill.

I want to express my full support for the extended coverage of the Voting Rights Act to include the Spanish speaking of the Midwest and other Spanish speaking people throughout the nation. I want to reaffirm my complete support for HR 5552 introduced by Congress persons Badillo, Roybal, and Jordan.

GUS GUTIERREZ,
Executive Director.

HOUSTON, TEX.

This is to confirm my full support of HR 5552 as introduced by Congress persons Badillo, Roybal and Jordan, a measure that will expand the coverage of the VRA to the Spanish in the Southwest and throughout the entire country.

LEONEL CASTILLO,
City Controller.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

As the National Director of SER, I want to express our full support for the expanded coverage of the Voting Rights Act to include the Spanish speaking in the Southwest and other Spanish speaking throughout the country.

Additionally, I want to reaffirm our full support of the bill H.R. 5552 introduced by Badillo, Roybal, and Jordan.

Sinceramente,

RICARDO ZAZUETA.

DENVER SER-JOBS FOR PROGRESS.

We express full support for expanded coverage of Voting Rights Act to include Spanish speaking in the Southwest and throughout the country. We also reaffirm full support of bill H.R. 5552 introduced by Badillo, Roybal, and Jordan.

SAM SANDOS,
Executive Director.

MEXICAN AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR
ECONOMIC PROGRESS,

Austin, Tex.

As President of Mexican American Council for Economic Progress, I want to express our support of H.R. 5552, the bill that will expand coverage of the Voting Rights Act to Texas and to other states in the Southwest. Please work for favorable passage of this vitally needed bill to include Spanish speaking in the Voting Rights Act throughout the country.

ARTURO CASILLA,
President.

AUSTIN, TEX.

This is to assure you of my full support for H.R. 5552 by U.S. Representatives Badillo, Roybal, and Jordan. There is a vital need for the Voting Rights to be expanded in the Southwest and throughout the country.

GONZALO BARRIENTOS,
State Representative.

HOUSTON, TEX.

This is to affirm my full support of H.R. 5552 by U.S. Representatives Badillo, Roybal,

and Jordan. The Voting Rights Act needs to be extended in the Southwest and throughout the country.

MICKEY LELAND,
State Representative.

CONGRESSMAN STUDDS' FINANCIAL STATEMENT

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1975

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD a copy of my 1974 financial statement:

CONGRESSMAN GERRY E. STUDDS' 1974 FINANCIAL STATEMENT

PART I—INCOME 1974

Salary, \$42,500.

Honorarium: National Education Association (money given to Constituent Services Committee), \$500.

Dividends: See Part II for detailed explanation, \$1,152.31.

Interest: See Part III for detailed explanation, \$213.12.

Total income, \$44,365.43.

EXPENSES 1974

Actual Official Expenses: (travel, stationery, district offices, telephones, printing, etc.), \$21,355.68.

Congressional Allowances for Official Expenses: (travel, stationery, district offices, telephones, etc.), \$11,579.68.

Difference: That is, official expenses paid from my pocket, \$9,776.

PART II—DIVIDEND INCOME 1974

Security	Number of shares	Income derived 1974
Burlington Industries	40	\$62.00
Exxon	87	433.33
Gulf Oil	80	126.00
Crown Zellerbach	40	32.00
Lincoln National Corp.	75	60.00
Union Pacific (sold 1973)	33	20.00
Trans Union Corp. (sold 1974, 1975)	33	121.32
Kennecott Copper (sold 1975)	33	76.66
Union Carbide (sold 1975)	67	145.00
Zenith Radio (sold 1975)	67	76.00

\$1,152.31

PART III—INTEREST INCOME 1974

Security	Bonds	Income derived 1974
Loew's Theater 6 7/8% debenture	\$3,100	\$213.12

PART IV—ASSETS

1. Beatrice Studts Irrevocable Trust: My brother, Colin A. Studts, my sister, Mrs. Howard Babcock, and I have placed the following securities—owned jointly by the three of us—in an irrevocable trust for our mother, Beatrice Studts, with my brother as trustee. All income from these securities goes to our mother for as long as she shall live. My brother, my sister, and I each own one-third of the securities—and they will revert to us upon the dissolution of the trust at our mother's death. The following represents my one-third interest in the trust.

COLIN A. STUDDS, III, TRUSTEE, BEATRICE STUDDS, IRREVOCABLE TRUST, UNDER AGREEMENT DATED AUGUST 1, 1973

Security	Bonds	Market value as of Apr. 8, 1975
Seaboard World Airlines cvt 5's, due Apr. 1, 1986	\$3,666	\$1,943
B. F. Goodrich 9 3/4 percent notes, due 1982	3,333	3,383
Federal Land Bank 7.45, due Jan. 20, 1977	1,666	1,654

Security	Number of shares of common stocks	Market value as of Apr. 8, 1975
West Point Pepperell	153	\$4,437
Chessie System	33	1,093
Liggett & Myers	92	2,553
Marine Midland	80	1,430

2. I OWN THE FOLLOWING SECURITIES

Security	Bonds	Market value as of Apr. 8, 1975
Loew's Theater 6 7/8% debenture	\$3,100	\$1,829
A.T. & T. 7 1/8%, 1982	3,300	3,225
U.S. Treasury 5 1/2%, August 1976	3,300	3,244

Security	Number of shares of common stocks	Market value as of Apr. 8, 1975
Burlington Industries	40	\$905
Exxon	87	6,232
Gulf Oil	80	1,550
Crown Zellerbach	40	1,295
Lincoln National Corp.	75	2,063

3. Our family home in Cohasset, Massachusetts, with an estimated market value of approximately \$65,000, is owned jointly by my brother, my sister and me. My interest in the house, therefore, is roughly \$21,500.

4. One bedroom cooperative apartment, Wash., D.C., estimated market value, \$60,000.

5. 1973 Chevelle Station Wagon.

6. 1966 Chevelle Sedan.

PART V—LIABILITIES 1974

1. Secured loan, Rockland Trust Company, Rockland, Mass., approximately, \$38,000.

2. Mortgage, cooperative apartment, Wash., D.C., approximately \$21,000.

3. Contingent liability—as guarantor of campaign debt, \$13,000.

PART VI—1974 TAXES PAID

Federal Income Tax (income averaging method), \$6,203.41.

Massachusetts Income Tax, \$1,481.98.

Local Property Tax (one-third of taxes on family home), \$829.09.

Automobile Excise Tax, \$168.12.

Total taxes, \$8,682.60.

GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1975

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, while thousands remain jobless in Michigan and across the country because of the slump in the auto industry, the bureaucrats at the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration continue to come up with ill-conceived proposals that threaten to aggravate conditions in the future.

The latest in a seemingly endless line of excessive Government regulations is a proposal for increased bumper standards for 1977 model cars that will push the cost up nearly \$30 a vehicle with no proven benefit.

At a time when negative buyer reaction to 1975 price increases, much of which can be attributed to Government regulations, has seriously hurt the industry and the overall economy, it is hard to believe NHTSA would propose another costly regulation without even giving it thorough consideration. It is this kind of fuzzy thinking that is partly to blame for the current economic situation.

Inadequate research by NHTSA has left virtually unanswered the question "What benefits does this new standard offer?" In fact, the only proven effect this proposal would have is to substantially increase the price of a new car.

After NHTSA's proposal earlier this year to lower bumper standards from the current 5 to 2½ miles per hour, this latest proposal makes no sense at all. In a matter of months NHTSA has backed off a policy of reducing these standards and announced a policy of increasing them, with no rational explanation of the change of mind. This indecisive policy alone points out the need for NHTSA to withdraw its latest proposal and go back to the drawing board.

It is unfortunate that NHTSA did not stick with its original plan for reducing these bumper standards. Such a move would have made good sense for our country's economy and our efforts to conserve fuel, by reducing the weight of a new car by 100 pounds and the cost by \$107.

The new proposal is disastrous economic and energy policy. Increased vehicle weight will make fuel economy that much harder to achieve, and increased costs will unnecessarily drive up the price of a new car at a time when the economy can ill afford such artificial increases.

Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to adequate bumper standards for our Nation's automobiles. But we should be realistic in working in this area. Boosting new car prices by imposing a Government standard that will produce minimal benefits at best, is not my idea of being realistic.

It seems to me that the current bumper standards are more than adequate. Even some officials at NHTSA must believe this, in view of the earlier proposal to reduce standards. If NHTSA policymakers are truly concerned with what is best for the country, they will stick with these current standards and back off of their latest hastily conceived proposal.

COMMEMORATING THE 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KATYN FOREST MASSACRE

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1975

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I commend and highly endorse the Chicago

division of the Polish American Congress Katyn Memorial Fund Committee on commemorating the 35th anniversary of the Katyn Forest Massacre—one of the greatest international crimes in world history. Your organization again reminds the world of the ruthlessness of the Soviet Communist criminal mind in exterminating all living opposition who might fight Communist aggression in its mad race to enslave the nations of the world.

On September 18, 1951, the U.S. Congress adopted a House resolution that I and several other Members of Congress filed authorizing a select committee to conduct a full and complete investigation of the crime committed against the leaders and citizens of Poland immediately previous to the beginning of World War II.

One of the persons contributing greatly to the success of the Katyn Forest Massacre Committee was former Congressman Roman C. Pucinski who acted as chief investigator and interpreter on the staff. Roman is to be commended for his diligence, ability, and industry during those complicated and intricate hearings, both in this country and in Europe.

The Katyn massacre was, no doubt, one of the most barbarous international crimes in world history. Of the Polish leaders who were executed from three widely separated Soviet prison camps, the bodies of 4,253 were discovered in the mass graves of the Katyn Forest located near Smolensk, U.S.S.R., by the Nazi troops in April 1943. This was approximately 3 years after the Katyn massacre. The Soviets immediately blamed Hitler for the crime. They charged that the Polish prisoners fell into the Nazi hands when Germany invaded Russia in the summer of 1941. The medical commission investigation consisting of leading doctors from various European nations, including neutral Switzerland, met at Katyn in April of 1943, and unanimously determined that the Polish victims were massacred in the spring of 1940. At that time the Katyn area was under the complete domination of the Soviets.

KATYN DUPLICITY

For almost 10 years after the discovery of the Katyn bodies, the Soviets poured out misleading propaganda declaring their innocence of any connection with the Katyn massacre or the murder of 14 Polish leaders who disappeared from three Soviet prison camps in the spring of 1940.

POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS

It was by reason of the concentrated efforts and insistence by the members and leaders of the Polish-American Congress of the United States that public opinion not only in America but throughout the globe, desired an official determination and investigation of the true facts concerning guilt of the Katyn murderers.

In 1951, I filed a resolution asking Congress to approve a special investigating committee to determine for posterity and future generations the guilt of the Katyn international crime. On September 18, 1951, House Resolution 390 was enacted by the Congress. This resolution called for a complete congressional investigation in order to determine offi-

cially the guilt for this atrocity against humanity.

HEARINGS AND TESTIMONY

Our congressional committee held hearings not only in the United States but also in England and Europe. During the progress of these hearings, over 250 witnesses testified. This number included government officials of various nations, military leaders, physicians, international lawyers, and persons from various nations, including Russia, who had direct and personal information on the international crime. Special invitations were sent to Stalin and other leaders of the Soviet Republic to appear at our hearings in London or Frankfurt, Germany. The Soviet leaders ignored and failed to respond to our invitations to testify and clear up the misinformation concerning the Katyn murders. During our hearings in Europe, the Soviet leaders through radio, television, Pravda, and other propaganda sources, continued a barrage of lies and false charges against the work of our congressional committee. A group of European newspaper experts stated at the time of our Frankfurt, Germany, hearings that the Katyn Congressional Committee for the first time placed the Soviet propaganda machine on the defensive. They had no answer to the testimony and the factual revelation of the evidence that the Soviet Communists were guilty of the Katyn Forest massacres.

Our committee publicly announced that the hearings should not take the spotlight away from the barbarous mass murders and pogroms committed by the Hitler Nazis during and before the period of World War II. Our committee found that the Communist atrocities were committed on other captive nations such as Lithuania, Hungary, Rumania, the Balkan States, and Korea, all had a striking similarity to the crimes committed against the Poles at Katyn.

COMMUNIST BARBARITY NEVER CHANGES

Although the Katyn massacre occurred 35 years ago, the evidence obtained by our committee revealed that the methods followed by the Communists we now know have not changed in violence or barbarity whether it is Southeast Asia or any locality on the globe where Communist aggression exists.

There is no doubt, in my mind, that the worldwide publicity given the testimony secured by our committee concerning the methods, strategy, and barbarity of the Communist tyrants alarmed millions of people of all nations as to the true facts of Communist enslavement. Our testimony, exhibits, and the facts and knowledge it gave the world contributed greatly to building up resistance by many nations and races against Communist aggression.

Since the Congressional Katyn Committee filed its final report in December 1952, hundreds of thousands of copies of this factual verdict and our official Katyn report of Communist methods and criminal acts have been requested by all non-Communist nations on the face of the globe. Thousands of organizations and individuals all over the world have, during the last 23 years, written to Congress and my office for the facts on the Katyn massacre. Hardly a

week passes but requests come to my office in Washington, up to the present time, from folks living in different parts of the world asking for information and copies of the final report of the Congressional Katyn Forest Massacre Committee.

Oftentimes I think that it would be, indeed, a worthwhile and valuable project if our Government or the United Nations would foster the expense or reprinting the Katyn congressional report exposing the Communists' brutality, barbarity, and methods of enslaving peoples under its domination. These reports could be printed in various languages and placed in the homes of all peoples in nations threatened with Communist domination and subjection.

SOVIETS COULD NOT HIDE GUILT

Throughout all our entire hearings proceedings there was not one scintilla of proof or even any substantial evidence presented that could remotely indict any other nation, but Soviet Russia for this deplorable international Katyn crime. The Soviets, in order to clear themselves in world opinion, refused to allow the International Committee of the Red Cross to make a neutral investigation of the Katyn massacre.

The overwhelming testimony of prisoners, formerly interned at the slave camp near the Katyn Forest, and of medical experts who performed autopsies on the massacred bodies and also of observers taken at the scene of the crime, conclusively confirmed our committee findings.

SOVIET PROPAGANDA ON DEFENSIVE

I know of no organization on either side of the Atlantic that has done more to keep the fight against aggression and expose Communist barbarity and enslavement than the Polish-American Congress. Your great national organization was responsible for the Katyn congressional investigations in the 92d Congress.

VIETNAM, KOREA, CAPTIVE NATIONS

If the free nations of the world would only join in concentrating the fight to expose the true facts against communism and educate the so-called backward nations concerning the criminality of Communist enslavement methods, and the true living conditions under their domination, there is no doubt but what the collapse of the Communist goal of world enslavement would take place in a short time. Too many of the new and backward nations have been victims of Communist misrepresentation and also of the false propaganda circulated concerning the government of the so-called free world.

Communism has been one of the greatest, most powerful, well-organized international threats to human freedom in world history. Our Government has spent billions of dollars fighting this international menace.

Stalin's government was an economic failure and at his death great discontent was rampant in not only the Soviet realm but the satellite nations. He was succeeded by Khrushchev, and his economic government was a total failure as was evidenced by his overthrow and collapse from forces within his own government.

If the present opposition to Communist aggression continues by the free nations, the rulers of today's Soviet tyranny will be overthrown and that will end the Communist myth of world domination. Communist China's economy has always been a failure and millions of its population are existing in starvation conditions at the present time. The free nations have the ability, the education, the defense machinery, and the assets to curtail the further spread of the Communist menace and we must continue our fight.

History has revealed over the centuries that dictators cannot stay in power long when they must rule their people by the sword, guns, slave-labor camps, and mass murders. The Communist dictators will meet the same end as Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo, and their predecessors since time began.

Our Government was negligent in overlooking the great potential possibilities in concentrating on educating the people of the world on the true facts of communism. I do not advocate in any way, curtailing the expansion and increasing of our military power so that we can cope with the Communists. A true Communist is a sworn enemy of America and freedom and everything that America stands for and we might as well face it. A true Communist believes that every nation and every person on Earth must be brought under the Communist dictatorship and that he has the duty to bring it about. This can be exemplified by the words of Lenin when he said:

We are living not merely in one state but in a system of states and existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with the imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end.

Education and presentation of facts on Communist enslavement to the world's uninformed are the greatest weapons democracy possesses to accomplish the destruction of the Communist menace.

BROADCASTING THE HOUSE

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1975

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday afternoon of this week the House Rules Committee, of which I am a member, will begin hearings on House Resolution 269 as introduced by the chairman of the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Brooks). This resolution would direct the House Commission on Information and Facilities to provide for radio and television coverage of proceedings in the House Chamber. Following a 6-month trial run of the system, the audio and video coverage would be made available to public and commercial broadcast stations. This resolution is cosponsored by 104 House Members.

Mr. Speaker, on January 29, 1975, I introduced a similar resolution, House Resolution 110, which now has 60 cosponsors, directing the Speaker to take

immediate action to implement a plan for audio and video broadcasting of House floor sessions, and making these broadcasts available to broadcast stations after a 6-month trial run. The resolution introduced by Chairman Brooks is much more detailed than mine, being based on the recommendations of his Joint Committee after extensive hearings in the last Congress. I therefore intend to support the Brooks resolution in the Rules Committee and on the floor. I wish to take this opportunity to commend Chairman Brooks and his committee for the thorough work they have done on this matter, and also to commend our Rules Committee Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Madden) on convening hearings on this important subject. At this point in the Record I include a list of the cosponsors of my resolution and the testimony I presented to the Joint Committee in February of last year.

COSPONSORS OF HOUSE BROADCAST RESOLUTION

James Abdnor (R-S. Dak.).
Bella S. Abzug (D-N.Y.).
Mark Andrews (R-N. Dak.).
William L. Armstrong (R-Colo.).
L. A. (Skip) Bafalis (R-Fla.).
Alphonzo Bell (R-Calif.).
Edward G. Blester, Jr. (R-Pa.).
William S. Broomfield (R-Mich.).
Clarence J. Brown (R-Ohio).
James T. Broyhill (R-N.C.).
Clair W. Burgener (R-Calif.).
James C. Cleveland (R-N.H.).
Silvio O. Conte (R-Mass.).
Lawrence Coughlin (R-Pa.).
Thomas J. Downey (D-N.Y.).
Pierre S. du Pont (R-Del.).
Robert W. Edgar (D-Pa.).
David F. Emery (R-Me.).
John N. Erlenborn (R-Ill.).
Marvin L. Esch (R-Mich.).
Edwin D. Eshleman (R-Pa.).
Millicent Fenwick (R-N.J.).
Paul Findley (R-Ill.).
Bill Frenzel (R-Minn.).
Louis Frey, Jr. (R-Fla.).
Sam Gibbons (D-Fla.).
Benjamin A. Gilman (R-N.Y.).
William F. Goodling (R-Pa.).
Gilbert Gude (R-Md.).
Tennyson Guyer (R-Ohio).
Tom Hagedorn (R-Minn.).
James F. Hastings (R-N.Y.).
Frank Horton (R-N.Y.).
Henry J. Hyde (R-Ill.).
James M. Jeffords (R-Vt.).
James P. Johnson (R-Colo.).
Jack F. Kemp (R-N.Y.).
Robert J. Lagomarsino (R-Calif.).
Manuel Lujan, Jr. (R-N. Mex.).
Robert McClory (R-Ill.).
Stewart B. McKinney (R-Conn.).
Andrew Maguire (D-N.J.).
Donald J. Mitchell (R-N.Y.).
Carlos J. Moorhead (R-Calif.).
George M. O'Brien (R-Ill.).
Peter A. Peyser (R-N.Y.).
Joel Pritchard (R-Wash.).
John J. Rhodes (R-Ariz.).
Ronald A. Sarasin (R-Conn.).
Patricia Schroeder (D-Colo.).
Keith G. Sebelius (R-Kans.).
Garner E. Shriver (R-Kans.).
Stephen J. Solarz (D-N.Y.).
J. William Stanton (R-Ohio).
Fortney H. Stark (D-Calif.).
Alan Steelman (R-Tex.).
William A. Steiger (R-Wis.).
Charles Thone (R-Nebr.).

CONGRESS AND MASS COMMUNICATIONS
(Testimony of Hon. JOHN B. ANDERSON)
Mr. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE: I am grateful for this opportunity

to testify on the subject of Congress and mass communications. I especially wish to commend the Joint Committee on opening this most useful and informative dialogue on the role and image of Congress as perceived by the public through the mass media, and what might be done to improve public perception of our role and activities.

I must confess that when I originally received notice of your hearings in late January, I gave the matter very little thought. But when the Harris Survey published on February 12 revealed that only 21% of the American people gave Congress a positive performance approval rating, I entertained second thoughts on the subject and decided to accept your invitation to testify. It's little consolation that Congress has only dropped 17 percentage points over the last year while the President has dropped 40. On the contrary, this is all the more distressing when you realize that the American people have practically lost all faith in all levels and branches of government.

On a more personal level, we should be particularly pained by the fact that the public apparently holds garbage collectors and used car salesmen in higher esteem than Members of Congress; and that 41% of the American people cannot name one U.S. Senator from their State and 54% cannot name the House Member from their district. All of this gives us ample cause for reflection and introspection.

The central questions posed by this inquiry, as I understand them, are: How can the role of Congress be more fully and accurately covered by the news media? How can spokesmen for Congress gain direct access more readily to the broadcast media to present congressional viewpoints on major questions? And what additional facilities, staff and other supporting services, if any, are required to provide Congress with a more adequate institutional capability in the area of mass communications?

The central premises advanced in the study prepared for these hearings are that there is a direct correlation between power and media coverage, that the Executive Branch controls a disproportionate share of both vis-a-vis Congress, and therefore, if Congress is to truly function as a coequal branch of government, as intended by the Constitution, it has a right to coequal coverage by the media. Based on these premises, the study proceeds to explore ways in which the Congress, as an institution, can increase its coverage by the media.

In my testimony today, I would like to take some qualified exceptions to these premises. Let me qualify my remarks by stating that, in my opinion, media coverage of Congress has been inadequate and superficial and must be improved; and that Congress can and should pave the way for greater media access to the entire legislative process. To this extent, the various alternatives explored by the Joint Committee study are most useful.

Having thus qualified my testimony, allow me to proceed to elaborate on the exceptions I take to these basic premises. It seems to me that we are engaged here in something of a chicken-egg-type debate. The central question seems to be, does the Executive Branch enjoy more power than the Legislative Branch because it is more adept at commandeering media coverage; or, does it command greater media attention because it is more powerful than the Congress?

I would like to suggest that this question is not so difficult to resolve as the chicken-egg controversy since in the present instance we can turn to the historical record of the past forty years or so. And that record documents the growth of executive powers and the relative decline of legislative powers, and attributes this mainly to the new economic and world roles of our government in the New Deal and World War II era, and the new

realities of our complex urban, scientific and technological age in the post-War period. And it shall be noted that this trend has resulted as much from congressional acquiescence as from executive usurpation.

To the extent that the mass communications media have chronicled this trend, I suppose they could stand accused of being accomplices after the fact—even of aiding and abetting the growth of presidential power. But I would submit that the role of the media in actually contributing to the increased growth of presidential powers has been minimal at best. That is not to say that the media, in reporting presidential activities, have not reinforced and legitimized the exercise of these powers in the public mind. It must be conceded that the media have played a role in this respect. But we must be careful not to attribute disproportionate weight to the media factor in the present imbalance—of crediting the messenger for the imbalance, as it were. It is my contention that the indirect role of the media in reinforcing and legitimizing presidential powers has been a very limited factor in the actual enlargement of those powers over the years, especially when considered alongside all the other factors which have contributed to the present imbalance.

I think it is most important to keep this perspective in approaching the subject under discussion in these hearings, for if we do not, it seems to me there is a real danger of expecting too much of any reforms we might undertake. If we attribute too much power and potential to the media in the power struggle between the branches, we will be falling prey to mistaking the media for the message. And, if we fall prey to that mistake, the inevitable result will be a tendency to shape the message, in this case the legislative process, to fit the media. I would suggest that we very carefully consider the full implications this might have on the responsible fulfillment of our legislative role.

Lest I be misunderstood, at this point, let me explain that I am not building a case for barring the electronic media coverage from either committee hearings on floor sessions. I happen to favor both. In the Legislative Reorganization Act to 1970, the House for the first time recognized the right of its committees to permit television coverage; and the Senate has allowed this for some 20 years now. In this Congress, the House passed a new "open committee" rule which insures greater public and media access to committee deliberations. I think it's healthy for our democracy to let the sunshine in; and I don't think it would hurt us one bit to let the klieg lights in. I can understand the concern of some that this would only encourage grandstanding, but I think the experience of numerous State legislatures and that of national legislatures in other countries, demonstrates that the novelty soon wears off and the legislators and the people benefit from the coverage. I think more committees of Congress should promote televised hearings and that the House and Senate should proceed to establish a system to televise important floor sessions on an experimental basis, with all due regard to maintaining the dignity and decorum of the respective chambers.

But, to return to my note of caution, we must be careful to distinguish between permitting full media access to the legislative process and reforming the legislative process in order to gain access to the media.

Journalist Douglass Cater, in his book, *The Fourth Branch of Government*, published way back in 1959, perhaps best explains the problems and dangers which I am attempting to convey. Cater addresses himself specifically to the celebrated congressional investigations of the fifties, but I think his words are just as timely today. In his words, "Amid the publicity drives of Congress, the investigative committee exerts

the most powerful thrust." He goes on to say that its net effect has been to divert the public's attention from the underlying ills in government which need legislative attention. Amid the aimless airing of charges, the quest reduces itself to a confused chase after individual villains rather than a purposeful inquiry to get at the root causes and to devise lasting solutions."

To quote Cater further: "The proliferation of publicity-inspired investigations has taken us in the direction of what might be called the mass media mandate. Decisions tend to be taken not in an orderly, procedural way but on the basis of what is instantly explainable through the mass media to the public. The trouble is that a great many complex issues of our time are not susceptible to this kind of explanation. To attempt to do so only serves to distract government from its more important tasks and to burden the public with choices it is not equipped to make. It opens the way for the demagogue who is prepared to oversimplify the grave issues of our time and to regard publicity as an end rather than a means in the drive for power."

Mr. Chairman, my warning is quite simple. In our frustration over inadequate and inaccurate coverage, in our distress over low public recognition and understanding, in our quest for a better image through improved communication with the public, let us avoid the "media mandate" trap and its potential for disfiguring and destroying the legitimate and responsible legislative process. Let us recognize that the legislative process in our democracy is, by its very nature, plodding and ponderous, and not necessarily susceptible to easy explanation by the electronic media. Marshall McLuhan might describe us as a linear process or "hot medium", not particularly suited for the "cool medium" of television.

To illustrate this, think for a moment, if you will, about what segments of televised hearings the networks choose to air on their nightly newscasts. I think you will agree that more often than not these consist of either short, sensational statements or heated exchanges. This is good television. But does it really convey to the public what the legislative process or the constitutional role of Congress is all about? I make these observations to underscore what I consider the very limited potential for either explaining the legislative process or redressing the balance, just as it was my contention that the media have played a very limited role in tipping the balance in favor of the Executive Branch.

I do not want to leave this committee on that note of pessimism and despair. I am not of the opinion that the Congress cannot recapture its rightful role as a coequal branch. While permitting greater media access to the Congress can reinforce and legitimize this restoration of congressional powers, the media is not the message nor the answer.

When Professor Alexander Bickel of Yale testified on war powers some years back, he quoted Sen. John Sherman of Ohio who said, shortly after the Civil War, that the way to resume specie payments was to resume. Paraphrasing Sherman, Bickel said, "The way for Congress to resume control over the foreign and war policy of the United States is to resume. The way to redress the balance is to redress it—by action."

If I might further paraphrase Bickel, the way for the Congress to make the news is to make news. The way to redress the balance is to redress it—by action.

I think this Congress has done more and is doing more than any previous Congress in which I have served in redressing the balance by action. And I think there has been a corresponding increase in media attention to the Congress because of this.

I further think it would be a grave mistake on our part to legislate a "media mandate" because we are frustrated, impatient and "Harassed" by the polls. I see no need to emulate the massive public relations apparatus of the Executive Branch; if anything we should be trimming some of that bureaucratic fat and insuring that neither branch becomes actively engaged in the "news management" business.

While the proposals contained in your study for more effectively communicating the institutional role of Congress are well-intentioned, I do not think Congress as an institution should be engaged in news dissemination or the production of educational materials. Such proposals as a congressional news service, federal information network, and congressional information and film services smack a little too much of news management and government propaganda for my comfort. I think news dissemination is best left to the news media and the production of instructional materials is best left to educators. The best news service the Congress can perform is to make news by newsworthy actions, not to manufacture news by slick devices. The best educational service the Congress can perform is to demonstrate that our constitutional system can function in the real world, not to fabricate instructional materials on how it is supposed to work.

Finally, I would like to say a few words about the "loyal opposition" in the Congress and its access to the mass media. I have detected in recent months a new willingness on the part of the electronic media to afford the "loyal opposition" in Congress greater access to the radio and TV networks for responding to presidential appearances. I think this is a most salutary development, and I hope it will be continued and grow. I can only add that I am sorry the "loyal opposition" under previous administrations was not afforded similar opportunities. I would caution, however, that Congress will continue to be viewed by the public as an obstructionist and negative force vis-a-vis the President so long as these opportunities are used only to react and criticize a president. It seems to me that whoever is in the opposition has a special responsibility to develop constructive alternatives to presidential initiatives if Congress is ever again to assume a positive and leading legislative role under our system. This is especially true when the Congress and White House are controlled by different political parties, but I think this opposition role can be just as important when the two branches are controlled by the

same parties. If Congress as an institution is only as strong as its weakest link, then it follows that a constructive and visible minority opposition party is a vital link in a strong institutional role for the Congress.

I would hope that arrangements between the "loyal opposition" and the media can be negotiated on a voluntary basis so that it does not become necessary to enter the sticky thicket of attempting to mandate media access for the congressional opposition or for the Congress as an institution.

Walter Lippmann once wrote that, "Nothing affects more the balance of power between Congress and the President than whether the one or the other is the principal source of news and explanation and opinion." Some would interpret this to mean that, he who rules the tube rules the roost. I have attempted in my testimony today to lend a different interpretation: he who makes news makes the news. Let us resume.

HANK AARON TO BE HONORED IN CLEVELAND

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1975

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday April 19, 1975, the Cleveland Indians Baseball Club and the Prince Hall Masons of Cleveland will present a special tribute to the unchallenged "King of the Home Run," Hank Aaron. My colleagues will appreciate the choice of this legendary sports figure as Cleveland's guest of honor on that occasion. Just last summer many of you were present in this Chamber when Hank Aaron was the guest of honor of the Flag Day Committee. Every year on June 14 a prominent American whose talents have contributed significantly to the American way of life is invited to speak from the podium of the House Chamber. Henry Aaron was the first active pro athlete to win that honor.

Hank Aaron has won many well-deserved tributes since his first game in Eau Claire in the Northern League in 1952. Since those humble beginnings he

has compiled a lifetime total of 724 home runs, and, in addition to breaking Babe Ruth's 39-year-old home run record, Aaron has 19 other major league marks to his credit. Hank Aaron is one of the century's greatest athletes, and an inspiration to us all.

My colleagues are familiar with Hank Aaron's extraordinary skills and accomplishments on the baseball diamond, but let me also point out that in addition to being the Nation's No. 1 athlete, Hank Aaron has also set an example as a caring, giving human being. Part of the proceeds from Cleveland's Community Tribute to Hank Aaron will go to the Hank Aaron Scholarship Fund, which includes a college scholarship and another which helps keep high school students in the classroom. His work for retarded children is well known.

In 1972 he sponsored the Hank Aaron Bowling Tournament which raised over \$25,000 for sickle cell anemia research. Hank Aaron has served as the national sports chairman for the Easter Seal Fund, and is the president of No Greater Love, an organization which helps the children of Americans missing in action in Southeast Asia. His humanitarian efforts show that here is not only a great competitor and sportsman in the American tradition, but one who has kept loving his fellow man despite all the hard obstacles on the road to success.

Mr. Speaker, as you know the Cleveland Indians are privileged to have Frank Robinson as their new player-manager, and the first black manager in major league baseball. Cleveland has always been a great sports town, and I am proud to say, a town where many of the great sports heroes have been blacks. But right beside Jimmy Brown, Harrison Dillard, Larry Doby, Jesse Owen, and other native son greats, Clevelanders have a special place in their hearts for Hank Aaron. The Special Community Tribute to Hank Aaron will be one way the people of our town can express their admiration for this fine gentleman, and we hope to have many more occasions to welcome him to Cleveland.

SENATE—Tuesday, April 15, 1975

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by Hon. RICHARD STONE, a Senator from the State of Florida.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, in these hallowed moments dedicated to acknowledging Thy sovereignty, preserve us from mere postures of piety, from superficial symbols of reverence, from praying with our lips only and not from our hearts and minds. As at creation Thou didst make man a living soul, destined for prayer, make us vividly aware of Thy presence, Thy power, and Thy grace. Make our hearts homes of love and purity and honesty, that we may be acceptable servants of

the Nation and worthy instruments for fashioning a world more nearly akin to Thy kingdom. In times of tension and stress keep us calm in temper, clear in mind, warm in heart, and sound in judgment. In dark days as in bright times help us to say, "The Lord is my light and my salvation; the Lord is the strength of my life, of whom shall I be afraid." Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,

PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,

Washington, D.C., April 15, 1975.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. RICHARD STONE, a Senator from the State of Florida, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,

President pro tempore.

Mr. STONE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 14, 1975, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.